# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about the Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion is the great variety of views put forward by the lecturers, a variety which would have surprised and in some cases deeply grieved the Founder of the lectureships. In earlier days we had Professor Pfleiderer's lectures which stirred a ferment in Edinburgh by their direct attack on the Gospel records, and raised the natural comment that it was strange to have in a professedly Christian university a lectureship under which it was legitimate to attack the Christian faith but not to defend it. On the other hand more recently we have had Karl Barth's Gifford Lectures in which without an apology to Natural Religion he expounded the Scots Confession of 1560. We have had James's 'Varieties of Religious Experience,' in which man is treated as a religious being, and now we have Sir Charles Sherrington's *Man on his Nature* (Cambridge University Press; 21s. net), in which man is dealt with as a marvellous conglomeration of cells. 'There is nothing in us except cells. The cell is a unit-life, and our life, which in its turn is a unitary life, consists utterly of the cell lives.'

---

As one would expect from so eminent a physiologist the descriptions here given of the human body in its constitution and functioning are masterly. In addition to fullness of knowledge Sir Charles Sherrington has the gift of lucid and pictorial description. The mechanism of the human eye has been often described, but never more exquisitely than here, while the simple act of waking from sleep is told in language so laden with imagination and wonder that it reads like a fairy tale. From this point of view the whole book is most informing and delightful to read.

---

But when we begin to ask such questions as we expect to be dealt with in a lectureship on Natural Religion the answers we get are less satisfying. The lecturer is strongly inclined to reduce everything to terms of physics and chemistry. The gulf between the living and the dead is bridged over. 'There is between them all no essential difference. The difference is not one of ultimate nature but of scheme and degree of complexity, nothing more. The elementary parts and elementary patterns are not novel. The atoms and sub-atoms are among Earth's commonest. "Living" becomes a name for certain complexes of them, arrangements of which it may be said that they are organized integratively, *i.e.* to form a solidarity, an individual.'

---

When we inquire how this wonderful process of differentiation and integration came to be, and how it continues, we are bidden simply accept the fact that there it is. Evolution does it; Nature does it. Of one thing we may be certain that it is of the earth, it is wholly from beneath. 'Let us not disown mother Earth; rather let us rejoice to call her "mother." Earth's nature is our nature. We

owe to earth the entire gamut of our mind's wonders, whether of joy or pain. Life's story has been an unfolding of germinal powers of the planet bringing emergence of mind. Let us give thanks where thanks are due. We are, in biological phrase, reactions. The situation creates the life that fits it. The dry land created the feet which walk it. Our situation has created the mind which deals with it. It is an earthly situation.'

---

One would fain subject some of these phrases to a Socratic cross-examination to discover if possible what it really is that is at work. Perhaps the best answer that can be given from the point of view of pure science is, in Sir Arthur Eddington's phrase, 'something unknown is doing we don't know what.' But we cannot be finally satisfied to throw everything back upon the cell and the atom. To quote a profound utterance of Principal Rainy in the first heat of the Darwinian controversy, 'The more you succeed in showing that the processes of Nature rise simply out of the permanent properties of elementary bodies, the more will you lodge in these elementary bodies an increasing complex of capacity and force. And if any one will assure us that the time is coming when all Nature, including all life and all mind, shall be resolved into and explained by the demonstrable properties and forces of the atoms of elementary bodies, we, not the least believing his prophecy, will reply to him, that if it is to be fulfilled, then we shall have atoms —and indeed short of that we already have them —so wonderful in the precision and in the capacity of their properties, that the one thing which people will *not* rest in, is the belief that these are so many eternal and necessary existences, whose reason and cause, in the case of each of them, is in itself.'

---

Strangely enough, after having belittled the distinction between the animate and the inanimate, Sir Charles SHERRINGTON stresses the uniqueness of mind. It is a thing *sui generis*; it cannot be expressed in terms of energy, though it can influence action. We are faced with the mystery of two systems, the physical or better named the energy-system, and the mental system, closely related and intricately intertwined. To the energy system belongs the whole world of action, to the mental system belongs the world of ideals and values. But these ideals seem insubstantial and for these values there is no standard. 'Sunrise and sunset *are* beautiful if one child feel them so.' Then are we to say, 'Tyranny and cruelty have value if Hitler feels it so?' By 'values' we have been accustomed to mean something of enduring worth, but if all is transient and doomed to the oblivion of eternal night it seems idle to speak of values.

---

What of Natural Religion? There is nothing left that could be called by that name. The concept of a personal God is an anthropomorphism. There is no higher mind than man's, and mind is earth-born and earth-bound. 'To attribute to it immortality while at the same time identifying it with the sum total of the activity of a body in itself notoriously mortal, involved certain contradictions.' So man finds himself standing on the lone summit with no 'higher mind and higher personality than himself to lean on and to seek counsel from.' And looking around him he sees Nature 'red in tooth and claw,' for his sensibility to pain and suffering is continually on the increase. It is a situation which has in it, as Sir Charles confesses, 'an element of enhanced tragedy and pathos.' It is a dreary creed which might well raise the question of race suicide, whether man should consent upon the rack of this tough world to be stretched out longer, or should not rather use his increasing control of the evolutionary process, if possible, to bring this sorry and meaningless play to a speedier end.

---

But Sir Charles is optimistic and ends on the note of responsibility and an appeal to the heroic in man. The situation, as he reads it, 'transforms the human spirit's task, almost beyond recognition, to one of loftiest responsibility. It elevates that spirit to the position of protagonist of a virility and dignity which otherwise the human figure could not possess. It raises the lowliest human being conjointly with the highest-Prometheus-like, to a rank of obligation and pathos which neither Moses in his law-giving nor Job in all his sufferings could present. We have, because human, an inalienable prerogative of responsibility which we cannot

devolve, no, not as once was thought, even upon the stars. We can share it only with each other.' One wonders to whom, in such a situation, we are responsible. But the plain man, conscious most of his own frailty, will feel that he is not cut out for the part of a Prometheus or God-defying Titan, or to take like mighty Atlas the whole burden of the world upon his back. Rather he will thankfully ask help from on high and feel it most fitting to walk humbly with his God.

---

When the author of 'Green Hell' (which is an account of a journey through the Bolivian Chaco) reacted in his youth, as did so many of his contemporaries in the 'twenties, from the intransigence of ecclesiastical orthodoxy; and even when, under the impulse of the examples of Sir Wilfred Grenfell and others, he sought to retrace the road that had led him from faith to agnosticism, he could hardly have anticipated that one day he would be joined to the company of Christian expositors. Yet so it has come to pass. At any rate, we venture to cite him in these columns.

---

In *I Am Persuaded* (Cape; 10s. 6d. net) Mr. Julian DUGUID has given us an account of a spiritual search which has brought him out of agnosticism and back to faith, so that he can now 'echo the words of the tent-maker who, in spite of his fear of women, had a wisdom not granted to many.'

---

The record of the actual search might have been told in many fewer pages, but we would not have it otherwise. There is much that is merely autobiographical, and much that seems otherwise irrelevant, but the whole constitutes by the author's artistry an engaging and impressive unity. Though the style is marred sometimes by carelessness, and is not devoid—to our ear at any rate—of rhythmical mannerism, it is fresh, vivid, arresting, and pervaded with a delightful quality of surprise. It is the sort of book that one would like to read from cover to cover at one sitting.

---

In our view the least satisfactory chapter is the last. Perhaps we entertained too high a hope as we approached it, and had thought that Mr. DUGUID, having travelled the way from anti-religious agnosticism to faith, would have gone further and emerged from that religious agnosticism, in whose twilight he appears still to move, which may go hand in hand with faith. Or it may be that we were prejudiced against a chapter that fails to show a due appreciation of Christian doctrine. It appears, for example, to confound Virgin Birth and Immaculate Conception, predicating the latter of Jesus instead of Mary. But this is a by no means uncommon error.

---

The publishers provide us with a good summary of this 'travel-book,' which explores 'the imperfectly charted and limitless territory of human consciousness.' Referring to the author they say, 'Using his own experience as a starting-point, he probes into the part played by heredity in the formation of the mind, and analyses the layers of conscious and unconscious thought behind the simplest action. He discusses with humanity and knowledge the problem of suffering, the bitter conflict between intellect and faith, the past failures of the Church, and her hope in the future.'

---

But this account does not give any impression of the strong human interest with which the author invests his pages, nor of the topical nature of many of his references, such as those to hypnosis, faith-healing, spiritualism, and schizophrenia. His spiritual experience, as one might guess, is of a mystical flavour; and he has relied in many places upon the co-operative partnership of his Helper, as he names certain influences, welling up from the unconscious depths of being, whose seat or locus is—as he would say—in the thalamus rather than the cortex. (No doubt the physiologist would as such demur to this speculative extension of the functions of the thalamus.)

---

This is a book from which one is tempted to quote freely: there is so much sincerity and eloquence in its treatment of the two cardinal subjects of a personal and loving God and human immortality. For the author those two beliefs are now *de fide*, and one will not readily forget how

they were re-awakened in his mind through the two simple and homely incidents of the 'lamp' and the 'desk.'

Here is a picture of his resistance to the belief in a loving God: 'The battle was a physical strain, no less deadly for being silent. I tasted something of the agony of Jacob when the angel touched his thigh. It is hard to write of this time, because so little happened physically: it was a struggle between layers of the mind. The cortex was hard and dictatorial, forbidding me to listen to the thalamus, who was emotional, womanly, unpractical. What a price we English pay for our condemnation of the emotions! The thalamus tried every trick, cajolery, threat and persuasion, but the cortex would have none of her arguments. God could not be a god of love in any rational meaning of the word, and that was the end of the matter.'

Two years later he attained to Christian conviction as to the character of God, and here is how he defends the use of the human analogy in the search after God: 'How else can we view the Creator than through human spectacles? The force in an atom is so blasting, the balance of electrons so exquisite, that an attempt to encompass the whole appears to me time-wasting foolishness. "The Lord is my shepherd" or "The Lord is a power-house": does it matter which we envisage, provided we acknowledge the link? Both are the ideas of children, the one of a pastoral age, the other of an industrial. When oppressed by the hugeness of it all, the blackbird in my garden helps me. As he runs, wormward bound, past my writing-desk I look at these complicated scratches on a white, ruled substance and wonder what he would make of them. Many millions of years lie between us, and his way will never be my ways; but the ink-formations are not meaningless, whatever his bright eyes think of them. They can be read and digested by my equals, even though the blackbird rejects them as unfit for avian consumption.'

But in another place he can say: 'Each Age should adjust itself to truth in the language of current affairs. Up to quite a short while ago, the idea of a heavenly Father was the only possible conception. Having experienced a little of the glory, a faint gleam from the ultimate, I still think it is the best description. It is actually truer to say: "The Lord is my shepherd. I shall not want," than: "The Lord is a power-house to which I can plug-in." It is more accurate because the feeling is personal. One really is helped to face life with a heightened vitality and courage.'

In the references to human immortality the following characteristic passage occurs: 'For myself, I am willing to acknowledge the mastery of Jesus Christ. Whenever I have followed His teaching, it has shown itself literally accurate. I cannot explain the laws which seem to govern His suggestions, but it would be untruthful not to proclaim their immediate practical results. If He was right about asking and receiving, about the Kingdom of Heaven within, is He any less likely to be informed on the question of personal survival? Some say, yes: some, no. The gulf is inescapable, it must either be leaped or refused. Yet, His cortex and thalamus were balanced to a degree not recorded elsewhere, and I prefer to place trust in this balance, rather than in an unbridled intellect. A runaway, carping cortex can be almost as dangerous to its owner as a loosely hysterical thalamus. It can isolate a man from the eternal, out of which he has grown and developed.'

We have found this to be a very attractive book; and, thanks to the publishers, it has been an unusual pleasure to handle it. We could, however, wish that Mr. DUGUID might some day carry his story farther. With the aid of modern theology, which is cultivated in the light of evolutionary science, and which emphasizes the ethical as distinct from the metaphysical in the approach to Christ, he might be able to align himself more definitely with essential Christian doctrine.

In a thoughtful little book, *The Night is Far Spent* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), Mr. Kenneth INGRAM has made a brave effort to correlate the

Christian religion with the coming 'revolution.' He is, quite frankly, a Socialist, but he is convinced that what Socialism aims at cannot be achieved without a religious inspiration, and in this book he sets out to describe both what Socialism aims at and what religion is. Let it be said at once that, with all its defects, the book is the work of one who is both able and very much in earnest.

---

Mr. INGRAM sketches the background of the coming civilization and insists everywhere on the personal aspect of the revolution which will be required if the new world is to be the creation of the will of the people, and indeed of the peoples of other lands. As to the former, he insists that our outlook must no longer be determined by a class-sense. Under the new order there must be a re-orientation of social values. The affinities between ourselves and our fellows will be cultural rather than economic. The professional man will no longer look on the shopkeeper or the clerk as a being of a different species. (No wonder Mr. INGRAM insists on personal conversion as one condition of the new age !)

---

All will be given the same opportunities of entering the professions, and so the caste basis of society will be abandoned. Also, a man's importance to society will no longer be measured by his wealth. It will be determined by what he puts into the pool, not by what he takes out. In short, the success or failure of the new civilization will depend upon the building up of a new culture, and this, once again, is an essentially religious task.

---

Mr. INGRAM everywhere uses religious language. He insists that the approaching revolution in human affairs is a religious event, and, if we are to take full advantage of the opportunity which it offers, there must be a corresponding religious awakening within ourselves. He even speaks of the need of a revival, of the urgent need of repentance, of conversion. He insists that we must become the conscious vehicles of a spiritual force, and that we must possess the faith and enthusiasm which religion alone can provide.

It is at this point that we begin to be somewhat disillusioned. Mr. INGRAM uses religious language because he is not prepared to hand over Christianity by implication to 'a monopoly of conservative and orthodox interests.' By his calculation the wrong sort of people have captured the formal strongholds of Christianity. He wants to call into action the spiritual force which is outside the enclosure of the Christian ecclesiastical system. But he is not abandoning Christianity. He is re-interpreting it. And specially, he is re-interpreting Jesus.

---

Mr. INGRAM fears he will be disliked and misunderstood both by conventional Christians and by atheists; by the former for selling the pass, by the latter for serving up the same old religious soft sawder. It is unlikely, however, that he will be misunderstood by either. He has taken pains to make his position clear. His attitude to Christianity is perfectly simple. He cannot be said to follow Jesus, because he does not believe in following anybody. But he stands where he believes Jesus stood. He shares what he believes were the convictions of Jesus.

---

But he is firmly convinced that our Christianity will have to be revolutionized as radically as our social system. For example, we must give up the idea of imposing doctrines, such as the divinity of Christ, on anybody. And we must cease insisting on the duty of attendance at public worship. Worship will always be the habit of a religious person, but the form of it does not matter. Communion also will be characteristic of the new Christian, but not necessarily the Holy Communion. Conversion is one of the basic needs for the new time, but it is the dedication to social duties.

---

And so the realities, on which we are accustomed to rely, seem to be slipping away. But, to do Mr. INGRAM justice, he does range himself with Jesus. And he sums up what Jesus stood for, as he understands the Gospels. First of all, Jesus believed in God and called Him Father. And that has a deep social implication. For it means that we are all brethren in a universal community. But that implies a recognition of the rights of others and this

will sweep away all inequalities. No social system which prevents the right to equal opportunity of each person can be Christian.

---

Then secondly, Jesus was not a moralist but a prophet. That is to say, He announced facts; He did not lay down a law. He was not an idealist but a realist. And therefore He did not try to coerce people or to impose His authority on them. He left them free. And as a consequence we do not accept His teaching because He gave it, but because it is true. It is not necessary to assign to Him a divine status. We are Christians because we find by experience that what Jesus taught is in accord with reality.

---

And thirdly, the outlook of Jesus was Jewish, and Jewish religion was 'unified.' That is to say, it embraced all life. Jewish religion was not sectional; it was not departmentalized. All aspects of existence were religious. There was for the Jew no separate realm of the material, the secular, the political. Hygiene, the ordinary social duties, the Kingship, the Day of the Lord, were all equally religious. And in this respect we in our European outlook have tragically fallen short.

---

We instinctively divide the spiritual and the material, with the result that we regard religion as a sectional interest, something which has a very indirect bearing on political and economic affairs. Which of us, without an exacting mental effort, could suppose that going off the gold standard, the conquest of France by Hitler, or the construction of a planned world-state had anything to do with religion? At most, Christians believe they should apply Christian principles to those social, secular problems. But in their minds there is a deep dissociation between the spiritual world to which religion belongs and the secular world of everyday activity.

---

This dualism is one of our deep-rooted mental habits. And it is wholly foreign to the mind of Jesus. He drew no boundary between religious and non-religious history. For Him God's will is revealed in history. For Him God's will is to be done in the hard realities of ordinary 'secular' life. And because we have failed to see this we have failed to realize what Christian duty is in the problems of our social system. It is one of the hopeful suggestions of the present crisis that we may be jolted out of our religious complacency and be compelled to look at life and social duty as Jesus did.

---

These are the main features of Jesus' teaching. And the religious 'revival' Mr. INGRAM hopes for is the acceptance of these truths by Christian people. The revolution he expects can only come through personal 'conversion' to this way of thinking and living. It is the faith that Jesus had, His devotion to God's will in the plain duties of social life, His outlook on the world as full of God and on all life as the sphere of religion, that we need if the true welfare of mankind is to be achieved.

---

We have drawn attention to this book because of its frank contention that the new 'order' after the war must be a Christian order, and that it can be realized only by a real religious faith. Mr. INGRAM thins away 'dogmatic' Christianity till little is left of that belief which was the heart and soul of the original Christianity that turned the world upside down. He does not perceive that what Christianity achieved, its 'revolution,' it achieved by just that faith which he considers unnecessary. But those who do perceive that will supplement his forceful argument with the truth which will give vigour and life to the motive which lies behind it.

# Spiritual Problems and the War.

## X. The Doctrine of Providence.

By the Reverend Nathaniel Micklem, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

The doctrine of Providence is generally raised in the form, Why does God allow the war? or, Why does God allow earthquakes? or, If God is good, why is there so much suffering in the world? It would be scarcely too much to say that for the ordinary thinking man the question of Providence is the supreme theological problem, urgent, real, and inexplicable beyond all others.

In distinction from the ordinary man's preoccupation with these problems of Providence we note that the great or central themes of Christian theologians are usually taken to be the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement. Most modern theological systems, it may be, have a section at the beginning on Creation and perhaps a final chapter on the Last Things, but certainly no explicit doctrine of Providence is central to them. This may be one of the reasons why theology is popularly supposed to have little connexion with 'reality' and with life.

For instance, I looked up 'Providence' in the Subject Index of the English translation of Schleiermacher's *The Christian Faith*. I am referred to two pages only, and these under the general heading of 'the Divine Attributes which relate to Redemption.' This, I admit, is not really fair to Schleiermacher, for the first part of his system of doctrine deals with the world from the special aspect of its relationship to religious self-consciousness. But that is the best that he can do, for, as he tells us, doctrinal propositions have their ultimate ground 'exclusively in the excitations of the religious consciousness,' and it seems probable that, if we would have a rational doctrine of God in relation to creatures, it is more important to take a look at the creatures than to excitate our religious feelings.

The Ritschlian school shows no improvement here. Ritschl, indeed, has a section on the belief in Providence as arising out of our reconciliation with God, but he carefully explains that we believe Divine Providence to be 'true,' yet not because we can follow or demonstrate its course objectively; 'we commit ourselves to it all the more decisively, the less we expose ourselves to the possible danger of falling into uncertainty in our knowledge of it through instituting a scientific kind of inquiry into its grounds.' This is to say, in effect, that the converted man will be sure of God's fatherly Providence, but even he can have no doctrine of God in relation to creatures. Ritschl's noble follower, Wilhelm Herrmann in his *Dogmatik* disposed of 'the universe' in a couple of pages. In later days Dr. Karl Barth has assured us that the doctrine of God as Creator of heaven and earth has 'absolutely nothing to do with a "world-view," even with a Christian world-view.' But here, as often, Dr. Barth's bark is more terrifying than his bite.

When the modern man asks, Why does God allow the war, etc? these modern theologians have answered in effect—though Dr. Barth, in particular, would cavil at my phraseology—that the converted and reconciled believer will feel in his heart that the Divine Providence is over all. But this, strictly, is the answer of pietism, not of theology. We may not claim to demonstrate the Divine Providence, but at least we must be able to claim that from the standpoint of faith we can make sense of the world or, at least, better sense than the unbeliever. As theologians we claim that in the dogma of the Blessed Trinity we have a doctrine of God which will much more than bear comparison with the speculations of infidelity; in the dogma of the Atonement we claim alone to be able to make sense of the tragic duality in human nature and human life; we must likewise profess a doctrine of Providence not less rational than the materialism of Karl Marx or the *Schwärmerei* of Alfred Rosenberg.

I have nothing new to add to the discussion of this subject, but it may be profitable to recapitulate in brief some of the propositions which have been laid down more fully and more competently long ago.

It might not unfairly be said of John Oman that he spent his life as a teacher in expounding the ways of Providence, but even he did not relate his doctrine to a general system of theology. Apart from him the modern teachers do not help us greatly. Nor does the first, the patristic, period of Christian theology meet our need. The Greek

Fathers were too preoccupied with the doctrines of the Trinity and the Person of our Lord, and were too concerned with the vindication of free will, to treat systematically the doctrine of God in relation to created things. Calvin, indeed, has a section on Providence in its proper place at the end of the first book of the *Institutes*, but it is chiefly to the great schoolmen that we must look for help in this most urgent and modern problem.

The doctrine of Providence declares that God rules the events of the universe and directs all things to their end. Obviously this doctrine cannot stand alone. It presupposes that God is, that He is the Creator and Sustainer of all things that are, and that the course of Nature including the course of history has a meaning or purpose. Those who question the ways of Providence, however, will sometimes grant these propositions which fall strictly outside the doctrine of Providence. For the moment it is only necessary to insist that the universe as a whole and every part of it has a meaning or purpose, and that God Himself is the 'end' of all things; for the things that are made 'set forth his eternal power and Godhead,' and, as each created thing tends to attain or preserve that which it has in it to be, so it tends to represent, or imitate, or be conformed to, some excellence or beauty in God. The proof of this—so far as it can be proved—is strictly outside our subject and cannot be considered here. The doctrine of Providence declares that God, who is the 'end' of all things, governs and rules the whole universal order and every part of it.

The universe, we say, is strictly a universe, a whole; it comes into being as a work of the divine Goodness, and its end is the same divine Goodness, whether as beauty and order reflecting according to various modes the glory of God or, as in the case of rational creatures, by consciously answering to the love of God. Of such a universe God Himself must obviously be the Governor. Nothing is better in the universe than the good of the whole; this, therefore, is the first object of God's Providence.

God holds all things in being. If He withdrew His hand they would cease to be. Of every event, therefore, God is Himself the cause. As First Cause God is the cause of every action or event in a more fundamental sense than are secondary causes. All secondary or inferior causes act in virtue of God's power. God is omnipresent, being wholly wherever He is; He is 'in' all things, not spatially or substantially, but as active cause.

But we do not so interpret the divine causality as to eliminate the reality of secondary causes. That would be the end of scientific knowledge, for science is wholly concerned with secondary causes. We maintain, therefore, the conception, so difficult to many, that natural effects are to be attributed both to God and to a natural agent. Yet in daily experience we are familiar with the idea that one event is due to divers causes; thus, for instance, when we see a pile of logs, we say, 'these were cut by a saw' or 'these were cut by a sawyer.' Both the saw and the sawyer are true causes of one event—though in different ways. Thus we do not ascribe part of an effect to God and part to the natural agent; we ascribe the whole effect to both causes—but in different ways.

How, then, shall we account for defect and evil in the world? Defect and evil remain a 'mystery.' Enough if we can see them in relation to the Providence of God. A man is better than an automaton; it is of the essence of a man that he *can* fall short of his perfection; now, things that *can* fall short *will* sometimes fall short. This principle applies also below the level of human life. Creatures reproduce themselves according to their kind, yet sometimes we find monstrous births in Nature. It belongs to the excellence of the universe as a whole that there should be spontaneity in it, and this excellence brings with it inevitably evil and defect.

Again, we can only build ships, which is a good, by cutting down trees which, in itself, is an evil, as all tree-lovers know. The principle runs through the universe: the production of one thing is the corruption of another; it must be so; therefore it does not befit the Divine Providence wholly to exclude evil from the objects of its care.

Again, that which in itself is good may be turned to evil uses. Many men go to pieces through strong drink, but the universe would not be better were there no fermentation in it and no grapes and no rye and no barley and no juniper. Further, there are many good things in the world which could not be if there were not also evil things; patience presupposes suffering, and heroism presupposes hazard. Mr. Koulson Kernahan once depicted the virtuous and happy 'Man of No Sorrows,' but could he be compared in majesty and glory with the Man of Sorrows?

Once more, the good of the universe as a whole is superior to the good of its individual parts. A discord here and there is contributory to the beauty of the composition as a whole. These considerations are for the most part independent of the obvious principle that human freedom may be abused and bring untold disaster.

The man in the street asks, If there is a God, where does evil come from? But we should rather boldly affirm with the angelic doctor, If there is evil, then there must be God; for there would be no evil except as a marring of an order intrinsically good, and this order of good would not be if there were not God.

As the Divine Providence does not universally exclude evil from things, so also it does not exclude contingency, nor does it impose necessity. It is in respect of proximate causes, not remote causes, that events are called contingent. The fall of snowflakes, for instance, is due to the law of gravitation which is a necessary cause. If a snowflake falls on my nose, the event is caused by the law of gravitation remotely, but its occurrence is contingent. Contingency is necessary to the universe, for that which exists of necessity is indestructible; hence apart from contingency there could be no change and therefore no such universe as this.

Hence, too, the Divine Providence is not incompatible with the freedom of the human will. In inanimate things the contingency of causes arises from imperfection and defect, as when a child is born with six fingers, but the contingency of the will springs from the very perfection of the will as a cause, namely, its godlike freedom. Any providence, human or divine, leads the things governed to their appropriate end. The voluntary agent attains its end, the likeness of God, by acting freely; therefore God's Providence can never rob man of his free will.

Theologians will be as aware as I am that most unoriginally I have been curtailing a familiar and well-worn argument. Nothing has been proved. I have been simply concerned to show that we inherit a doctrine of Providence. We are bound to assert (1) that God as the Author and Sustainer of the universe is in all things, that He guides all things to their end, and as the First Cause causes all events by His power; (2) that this does not rule out contingency and therefore evil from the universe, and (3) in particular, it does not rule out the freedom of the human will. Up to a point it helps or enables us to see or conceive how these necessary propositions may be simultaneously true. Explanation it is not, still less proof. It is easy to frame a tidy and self-consistent theory of the universe where necessity rules, or, again, a theory where contingency and freedom eliminate necessity, but such theories are imposed upon our experience of the world and of life; they are tidy at the expense of depth. It is more rational and true to assert that which experience teaches us than to abandon thought because we cannot solve all mysteries.

God's 'foreknowledge' does not set us a problem, for it is an improper term. God is eternal Being, knowing neither before nor after. God wills that the universe should be what it is, a universe in which some things happen of necessity, some contingently, and some by the free choice of rational beings. Moreover, since all agents act in virtue of the power of God, He is the first agent in every event, and His Providence extends to every detail.

I have written little of the psychological and spiritual problems of pain and sin, but I have indicated the underlying principles, and have been concerned to show that the doctrine of Providence concerns Nature in general as well as human history.

I close with two comments. First, it is, no doubt, possible to find or to postulate something in animate and even in inanimate Nature analogous to freedom in human beings. In recent years eager apologists have hoped or claimed to find in the 'quantum theory' some justification for this view. But such speculations belong to the philosophy of religion, not to theology. The theologian says, 'This is how you will view the world, if you start from the Christian revelation, and,' he adds, 'you will find that the Christian view alone makes sense of the life we are all called to live.' Our doctrine of Providence is not a matter of proof, but at least it is not facile and shallow as the vagaries of unbelief.

Second, I have used the language of the schools, not of personal religion. Our doctrine expresses in philosophical form the dual religious assumption of the Gospels that this is God's world under the fatherly care of God who clothes the lily and feeds the ravens when they cry, and also that in large measure Satan rules this present age. The religious significance of the doctrine is memorably expressed by Calvin: 'This is the comfort of the believer to understand that the Heavenly Father doth so embrace all things with his power, that nothing befalleth but by his appointment; and that he is received into God's keeping, and cannot be touched with any hurt of water or fire or sword, but so far as it shall please God the Governor to give them place. . . . And from hence proceedeth the boldness of the saints. For, when they call to mind that the devil and all the rout of the wicked are so everywhere holden in by the hand of God as with a bridle, that they can neither conceive any mischief against us nor put it in train when they have con-

ceived it, nor can stir one finger to bring it to pass, but so far as he shall suffer, yea, so far as he shall command, and that they are not only holden fast bound with fetters but also compelled with bridle to do service, here have they abundant springs of consolation.'

But the doctrine of Providence we set forth not only in the Church as the source of our abundant consolation but also in the market-place as the rational interpretation of the life of man on earth. As rational interpretation it belongs to the sphere of natural theology; as source of consolation, it is most intimately connected with the Christian doctrine of the Godhead as Father, Word, and Spirit. For the believer apprehends that the Creator is also the Redeemer, and that the Power which sustains the world is identical with that Spirit which cries Abba, Father, in our hearts.

# Literature.

## *MIND AND DEITY.*

In a review of the first series of Dr. John Laird's Gifford Lectures the hope was expressed that in the second series, now published under the title *Mind and Deity* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), a more conspicuous superstructure would be raised on the foundations so well and truly laid in the earlier book. The hope is justified to some extent, and we are given at least a first storey, planned on generous lines and, above all, securely built. But the author is almost excessively apprehensive lest at any time he may be tempted to put his philosophical conscience into cold storage; he concludes —regretfully on his own part, and to the great loss of the many readers whom he will inspire with confidence—that any further upward building is not for him, and he is more than a little doubtful as to the quality of the materials which would have to be used in any loftier construction.

In the previous lectures, after assessing the value of the cosmological and teleological arguments, he had permitted himself the conclusion that the world is intrinsically *deiform*, and that a godless world is a misconstrued world. The question of the present series is, How far can we use our minds for the construing of the world and as the basis of a belief in Deity? A natural transition to the new point of view is found in the ontological argument, and Dr. Laird quite unnecessarily apologizes for abruptly introducing his philosophical tourists into this rarified atmosphere. He assumes however that his 'tourists' are tough, and the assumption is more necessary than the apology, for no easy-going meandering of thought is permitted under his guidance. A brilliant analysis—following, but clarifying, Kant—yields the conclusion that the value of the ontological argument lies in its being not an argument but an assertion of the identity of thought and being. An assertion is totally different from an argument in that the former is 'given' and not deduced.

A penetrating disquisition upon the nature of thought enables Dr. Laird to challenge the Hegelian suspicion that there is something rather disreputable about the knowledge of an object which is not identical with the knowing subject. It would have added greatly to the interest of his treatment if at this point he had broken through the persistent provincialism of Western philosophy and given us a discussion—which would have been invaluable from a philosopher of his quality —not only of the Hegelian but of the almost exactly similar, though much older, assertion of the Indian Vedānta. His masterly handling of the idealistic position generally is more or less in agreement with Pringle-Pattison's, but is more incisive and incontrovertible.

Dr. Laird's examination of Divine attributes such as Omniscience, Providence and Personality, yields little in the way of positive results, but he certainly leaves us with the confidence that what his logic allows us to have we may hold securely. As regards the first attribute, he refuses, as he puts it, to be 'metaphysically intimidated' into the belief that nothing is knowable unless it is already known to God, and, as regards the second, he prefers to think that the graciousness of things is a feature of the world's pattern and is not *put into* the world by the special grace of a supramundane God. Similarly, the question of the personality of God seems to him to be of secondary importance, and he thinks that we should concern ourselves with the beneficence of Nature and the distrib-

utive justice of the cosmic order rather than with speculations as to their source in a Divine personality. He is doubtful, however, about the coincidence of existence and value, and suggests that those who assert this identity, are surreptitiously arguing that because everything must have value in the sense that it is either good or bad, therefore everything must have value in the sense that it is good. He examines the moral proofs for the being of God with the greatest care, chiefly by means of a most valuable exposition of the theory of Kant. He suggests that the latter unjustifiably regards rightness as an operative agency, whereas rightness no more *causes* right action than the greenness of a signal *causes* the motor car or its driver to proceed in the proper direction.

Dr. Laird's final position seems to be a pantheism with a theistic tendency. God is, for him, the deiformity of things, and 'the fact of order itself is the fact of deity.' Man in his relation to God has to do with the end of the line of communication nearest to himself, and this is really all that matters. Dr. Laird has passed far beyond the stage at which, as he himself says, he thought that 'theism was a decrepit metaphysical vehicle harnessed to poetry.' He does not even yet allow that theism can be proved, but he is impressed by the strength of its metaphysics; and he holds that, if it cannot be proved, it most assuredly cannot be disproved.

Dr. Laird justifies his truncated conclusion by saying that it is illegitimate to attempt to discover a reason for existence, and that we must be content to study the rational connexions *within* existence. This position seems to be unnecessarily static, and to suggest that because we do not claim to have explained, we can at any stage be permitted to give up the quest. There is a slight inclination to bring belief in a transcendent God under the condemnation of 'trying to discover a reason for existence,' and this inclusion seems to beg the very question at issue by suggesting that a transcendent God is *outside* of existence. Unquestionably our thought must move within existence, but the question is, Which is the better description of the existent? We submit that Dr. Laird has not proved the case in favour of a diffused deiformity in preference to the admission of transcendence as well as immanence. He himself speaks of the 'concealed presence of the End' and of ideality as depending on actuality. These phrases, as well as his use of the word 'insight,' suggest more definiteness than Dr. Laird is willing explicitly to allow. Again he says that 'the world is knowable because it is intelligible,' and that this is altogether different from saying that it is knowable because it is *known*. Must we always move in the region where words ending in 'ble' alone are applicable, while our craving for actuality, which is much deeper than a mere desire for a philosophically tidy universe, remains unsatisfied?

This is a difficult book, more difficult than it need have been, because of the frequent use of recondite words even when there is no technical necessity for them, but it is one of the most important books on its own subject which we have had for a considerable time. Of Kant the author says, 'The more I read of Kant . . . the less inclination I feel for making confident pronouncements about what his theory really was,' and he speaks of Kant's intellect as 'the most powerful that has adopted this way of arguing in modern times.' It would not be out of place to apply *both* remarks to Dr. Laird himself.

W. S. URQUHART.

---

## *THE MIND OF THE MAKER.*

Miss Dorothy L. Sayers has given delightful relaxation combined with exercise to the minds of a host of readers by her deft mastery of a type of fiction which commands ready welcome. She has now put us under a debt of another kind. She has entered the field as a theologian. She herself would deny that. She claims to be just a professional writer dealing with a theological subject. Yet one who can deal with theology as she does is undoubtedly a theologian, deny it as she likes.

Her book is entitled *The Mind of the Maker* (Methuen; 6s. net). It is the first of a series called 'Bridgeheads,' of which she is joint-editress with Muriel St. Clare Byrne. The motive for the series seems to be a desire to get across to the new world which the war is making with some fundamentals which in the present chaos are threatened with oblivion; and to put them across in a form which the new world will understand.

Many inside and outside the churches are showing concern as to whether the Church, as the institution with which we have been familiar, can or should survive. The correspondence columns of the Press in recent weeks have given evidence of a widespread feeling that something should be done about the Creeds; and varied suggestions are offered as to how to carve and transform the venerable symbols of the Faith to make them pass muster in the hoped-for brave new world. Miss Dorothy L. Sayers is not concerned with constructing a new Creed. She expressly warns us, indeed,

that we are to form no opinion as to her personal creed from her book. Her volume is intensely interesting because she sets herself to show that an important part at least of the familiar Creed is capable of being presented to any thinking person as a tenable and intelligible article of Faith. The item she selects is—of all subjects!—the Doctrine of the Trinity. So many outside the Christian body, and so many inside it, have been disposed to dismiss this Doctrine as non-essential. They have thought of it as an abstruse metaphysical puzzle towards which it was quite unnecessary to take any personal attitude. They have thought of the statements of the *Quicunque vult* as mere lumber which should be discarded.

This book, however, will give all such 'furiously to think.' Are such statements about the Triune God mere arbitrary mystifications or are they statements of what really is true of God?

How can man know God? Our authoress answers, in brief—man can know a good deal about God the Creator by analysing himself as creator. The critic will shout immediately 'anthropomorphism!' So Miss Sayers has some snappy and altogether excellent remarks about this bogey of anthropomorphism. There is, of course, crude, worthless anthropomorphism, but all man's thought, whether it be directed to God or to the physical world, is, and can only be, 'human.' Man was made 'in the image of God,' it must therefore be permissible to draw helpful 'analogies' from the one to the other. Man is creative, and man as creator rises to his full stature in the artist. If, then, the artist will analyse his own creative activity, will he not have attained at least a measure of insight into the build of the mind of the Creator God? The authoress, herself an artist familiar with the creative experience, finds that in the Doctrine of the Trinity theologians have ascribed to God nothing else than the 'pattern' of Being which she finds in her work and in herself. There is a necessary and complete Three-in-one-ness. In the mind of the artist are the timeless Idea, and the Energy begotten of the Idea, and the Power of the Idea most manifest when clothed in language upon the reader, but existing in the mind of the artist. So we may reason analogically to a Three-in-one-ness in God.

This is a quite original argument. Others have reasoned analogically from the one human mind with its three 'faculties' to the one God in three Persons, and have so argued without much convincing power. Here we are taken on what seems to us a surer road and have the conception of the Creator-God illumined by a clearer light. It is certainly worth consideration.

The book abounds in good things, many of them just flung in incidentally. It is, indeed, one of the most refreshing and stimulating books of recent times. W. D. NIVEN.

---

## *WOMEN'S WORK AND MESSAGE.*

Dr. Maude Royden's new book, *Women's Partnership in the New World* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), is a book of remarkable interest and ability. If any ignorant person expects to find in it a feminist blast, he, or she, will be very much disappointed. I should say that its main characteristic is its solid common sense. And the chief thing that has struck me in Dr. Royden's writing and thinking is its modest competence. The style is easy, direct, and satisfying; and so is the thought. She is dealing with a great subject, and she rises to it admirably. But there is something else in the book which is difficult to put into words. Dr. Royden somehow or other gets across to us a personal impression. I was left at the end of the book with a strong liking and admiration for the writer herself. And that is a thing one can seldom say of any book.

Dr. Royden's main point is that women's sphere is the home. She writes about this, and emphasizes it with real eloquence, because she believes that a woman's work in bearing and training children is as great as anything done in the world. And therefore her relations with others are personal. She is concerned about people. To her the individual is of supreme value, and because she thus echoes the Christian affirmation which is at the basis of liberty and democracy, this may be regarded as her message to the world. It is this that will deliver us from the crushing tyranny of the machine. The first thing woman did for civilization was to slow things down and insist on having a quiet space for the making of a home. And now she can do something as great by delivering the world from the soul-destroying power of the machine.

Dr. Royden values the great public work of women scientists and social workers. But she thinks these great women of this type will always be the minority. What the world needs is what women can help it to get, a space in life for leisure, a life that is hard but not overwhelmingly hard, the necessities of life in food and clothing, but not suffocating wealth, *and* room to be free, to read and be amused and worship. These, baldly stated, are the chief points in the book. But there is much else. In her discursive manner Dr. Royden touches

on many topics that are suggested by her main theme, and always with some glancing reflection that is suggestive and enlightening. I hope that many women will read this book, and many men too, for it will inspire both. F. J. Rae.

---

We were quite prepared to feel our flesh 'creeping' when we started reading *Let's Try Reality* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. W. Rowland Jones, Vicar of St. Hilda's, Denton, Manchester. We were informed on the 'jacket' that, after a various ministry, Mr. Jones obtained 'a nation-wide audience' through the columns of a leading London paper. 'Rowland Jones has leapt into the forefront of war-time thinkers,' we read. The leading London paper with a nation-wide audience turns out to be the *Daily Herald*. For that paper Mr. Jones wrote a series of articles, but after two months they were dropped, through 'some force or other.' Like Mr. Priestley he was silenced. And so he has had recourse to a book, and here we have the materials for estimating his position as a foremost war-time thinker.

Well, it is in many ways a sound book. But many people, and many books, have said over and over what Mr. Jones says here. One of his objects is to expose shams, and he has succeeded, if one-sidedly, in doing that. There is a good deal of sham in the Church, and Mr. Jones does not spare his own branch or his own brethren. 'Apart from income-tax officials, the clergy are probably the most unpopular class of beings in this country,' he says. The Prayer Book is hopelessly antiquated and utterly unreal in its language and sentiments. There is also a good deal of sham in politics, and everywhere else. And it will do both clergy and politicians good to read what Mr. Jones says about them. But one grows tired of this constant exposure of faults without a sufficient counterpoise of appreciation. Half the truth is often the worst kind of misrepresentation. And it is to be feared that that is the defect of this otherwise useful criticism.

In one respect Mr. Jones has uttered a needed warning. He fears that the possessors of privilege are lying low at present; but, when the victory is won in this war, they will assert their claims with fierce energy, and will strive to put obstacles in the way of those bright hopes of a new world of equal opportunity for which so many are looking. His emphasis on this is the best thing in his eager book. And of this book generally one may say that if it showed as much consciousness of the good in Church and State as it does of the evil, we should welcome its drastic animadversions.

---

Mrs. R. Rowntree Clifford, O.B.E., has been highly successful in her work among women. The women's meeting of which she is the founder and leader is claimed to be the largest of its kind in the world. In *The Handmaid of the Lord* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net) she has published a dozen of her addresses. The themes are all chosen from the gospel story and deal with the women whom Jesus met and taught. The addresses are brief, affectionate, and deeply devotional. They are fitted to bring personal religion into the homes and daily lives of women, and to encourage them to trust in Jesus as their living Saviour.

---

The Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead has written a capital little book on *Guarding Our Sunday* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6d. net). He deals with the origin and value of Sunday, the attitude and teaching of Jesus, and the practical difficulties which arise in the life of to-day. Two guiding principles are suggested: 'Does my use of Sunday avoidably rob another of the chance of worship? Does my use of Sunday contribute to its secularization?' These questions are dealt with in a firm, reasonable, and incisive way. It would be difficult to find in so short a compass so illuminating, practical, and persuasive a presentation of this vital subject.

---

One of the chief tasks which preachers and teachers of the Bible have to undertake is to modernize its message, so that Christ may step out of the pages of an ancient book and become a living reality to the men and especially the youth of to-day. Translations into modern English have given welcome help in this task. Now the problem has been approached in a very fresh and interesting way by the publication of *The Bible for To-day*, edited by Mr. John Stirling, with illustrations by Rowland Hilder and other artists (Milford; 21s. net). It contains the text of the Authorised Version with introductory paragraphs, headlines, and footnotes which make the Bible an easily readable book, printed in paragraphs like other books. But the special feature is the illustrations, of which there are about two hundred. They depict scenes from the world of to-day which, when set alongside of the Scripture text, show that the conditions of human life, its joys and sorrows, hopes and fears, achievements and sufferings, are essentially the same in every age. The Assyrians' threat to Jerusalem in Isaiah's day becomes very

realistic when set beside a picture of murderous tanks crashing through a city, and the infinite pathos of the deportation of the people in Jeremiah's time is strikingly portrayed by illustrations of modern refugees on weary trek or huddled in miserable camps. In the New Testament there are many illustrations of what it means in modern times to follow Christ and to live and die for His Kingdom. This may give sufficient indication of the character and purpose of the book. It is an ingenious and notable attempt to represent the Saviour of the world walking on the waters 'not of Gennesaret but Thames.' As such we heartily commend it and can well believe that it may do a great work in captivating the imagination of the youth of to-day.

---

The last war gave us a number of books containing addresses by chaplains; it has been left to this war to give us a book of addresses *to* chaplains. Very wisely the Army Chaplains Department has instituted a Reception Centre at which young chaplains, before taking up their duties, receive a fortnight's training which must be immensely useful to them. *A Religion for Battle-Dress*, by the Rev. Ronald Sinclair, M.C., C.F. (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net), contains a series of ten addresses delivered to the chaplains at the School. They are worthy of the highest commendation, being wise, brotherly, deeply religious and heart-searching. Naturally they deal with the chaplain's work and are illustrated by incidents from army life, but they deserve to reach a far wider public. Not chaplains only but all ministers and teachers of religion will find here much guidance and inspiration and food for thought.

---

The fourth and final volume of Mr. W. E. Vine's *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* has now been issued (Oliphants; 10s. 6d. net). It covers 'Set' to 'Zealous,' and so has to deal with few terms of theological importance; but the volume is worthy to rank with its predecessors for painstaking scholarship. The volume contains in addition 'Addenda and Corrigenda,' and a very full index. We are glad that the exigencies of our time did not prevent the completion of a remarkable work, which, as we have said before as each volume came under review, is fitted to be of great value to all students of the New Testament whether they have knowledge of Greek or not.

---

The S.P.C.K. has issued a little book on *Pastoral Preparation for Marriage* (1s. net), which has been compiled by the Blackburn Moral Problems Group. After laying down some general principles and methods of instruction, the writers suggest certain 'lines for an interview.' One may be excused for having grave doubts as to the advisability of ministers of religion instructing engaged couples in the intimacies of sexual life and the procreation of children, but on the whole the talks outlined here deal with these matters with commendable reticence and good feeling.

---

# Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

## After the Harvest.

**1. The Threshing.**—The sheaves were taken on the back of asses or in a cart (Am $2^{13}$) to the threshing-floor (Hebrew *gôren*, Gn $50^{10}$, Nu $18^{27}$, Dt $15^{14}$ R.V., Jg $6^{37}$ R.V., Job $39^{12}$ R.V., Mic $4^{12}$ R.V., etc.), so that the grain might be separated from the straw. The stalks were generally very short, especially if the season had been a dry one; and they did not form the beautiful tall sheaves that the Egyptian artists delighted to picture (cf. the sculptured designs in the tomb of Queen Ti, *c.* 1400 B.C.). The whole village population usually set itself to the threshing with joyful enthusiasm. The most primitive plan adopted, which is amply illustrated in the Egyptian bas-reliefs, was to have the sheaves trodden by young oxen, sometimes yoked together, and an Israelite enactment, based on ancient compassionate custom, forbade the muzzling of the animals in such a case, lest they should be prevented from taking a share of the grain (cf. Dt $25^{4}$). Oftener, however, a rudimentary contrivance was used consisting of a wooden sledge or drag, about six feet long and three feet broad, bent up in front, and having pieces of pointed flint or iron fixed on its under side (cf. Is $41^{15}$). It was

drawn by oxen, which were guided over the heaps of sheaves by a driver, usually a boy, seated or standing on it. Being thus weighted, it performed the double work of breaking up the straw as well as separating the grain from it. This 'apparatus' was adopted by all the Mediterranean agricultural people at an early epoch. It is the *tribulum* of Roman antiquity (cf. Virgil, *Georg.*, i. 164) and the τρίβολοι of Grecian times (cf. *Mathematici Veteres*, ed. Paris, 1693). The word used for it in Hebrew was *môrag* (cf. Is $41^{15}$, 2 S $24^{22}$, 1 Ch $21^{23}$, etc.), which was sometimes accompanied by the epithet *ḥaruṣ* 'sharp' (cf. Is $28^{27}$ R.V., $41^{15}$). In the course of time a variant type developed, known in classical antiquity as the *plaustellum* ('threshing-wagon'), in which the stone or iron teeth were replaced by sharp wheels, generally dented, which ran on several rollers and probably served the purpose better (cf. Pr $20^{26}$ R.V., 'threshing-wheel'; Is $28^{27}$, 'cart-wheel'). For the very small grain or spices, such as the 'fitches' (*i.e. nigella sativa*) and the cummin, the threshing was done by beating with staffs or rods (cf. Is $28^{27}$), a method sometimes adopted for ordinary grain if the quantity was small (cf. Jg $6^{11}$ R.V., Ru $2^{17}$).

2. **The Winnowing.**—The product of the threshing was winnowed by means of a wooden pitch-fork with six prongs, known in the Old Testament under the name *mizreh* (from the root *zārah*, 'to disperse') and incorrectly translated 'fan' (cf. Is $30^{24}$, Jer $15^{7}$). In the process the June breeze carried the chaff (*môṣ*) far away (cf. Ps $1^{4}$ $35^{5}$, Hos $13^{3}$, etc.), and the broken straw (*tebeṇ*, translated 'stubble' in Job $21^{18}$) also to a certain distance, while the grain, being heavier, fell to the ground close at hand. A second winnowing was sometimes carried out by means of an instrument called *raḥath* (cf. Is $30^{24}$), which appears to have been a wooden shovel rather than a hand-fan as some scholars suppose; and a final sifting of the grain was often given with a sieve (cf. Am $9^{9}$, 'as corn is shaken in a sieve').

3. **The Storage.**—Both the *teben* and the grain were transported, generally in goats'-hair sacks, from the threshing-floor to the family dwelling, though not as a rule till the creditors and tax-collectors by way of precaution had taken their legal share. In the house the grain was preserved in special receptacles, such as the large jars discovered by Garstang in the palace at Jericho, belonging to City III of the Middle Bronze Age (*c.* 1750–1600 B.C.). Here some sixty-eight storerooms were examined; and numerous grain-jars, about three feet high, containing charred remains of barley, oats, millet, and sesame, were found buried with their mouths at floor level (this no doubt to avoid the danger of fire and even of spontaneous combustion in such a dry climate). Later, during the Iron Age, we find certain 'hole-mouth' jars, almost cylindrical in shape, employed for the purpose. These had the rim sometimes turned inward so as to form a groove, on which a corresponding stone lid could fit. Often, however, bins or fixed receptacles were used, such as (beginning with the earliest times) pits sunk in the surface of the ground and often lined with pot-sherds or gravel (as at *Teleilât Ghassûl*, before 3000 B.C.), or grain-stands in clay or *pisé* not unlike those met with in Palestine and Syria at the present day, especially in the villages of the plains. These latter were probably the kind of granaries or 'barns' mentioned in the Old Testament under the name of *megûrah* (cf. Hag $2^{19}$) or *mammegurah* (Jl $1^{17}$, where the prophet laments that they have been broken). Several other terms for storehouse or barn occur, but the particular signification of them is rather vague. Thus, we find *âsâm* (Dt $28^{8}$, Pr $3^{10}$), *ma'abûs* (Jer $50^{26}$ R.V.m.), *ôṣâr* (Mal $3^{10}$, Jl $1^{17}$ 'garners,' 1 Ch $27^{25}$, Neh $13^{12}$ 'treasuries'), and *miskenôth* (2 Ch $32^{28}$). Large central grain-bins or silos, either below or above the ground level, were not uncommon, especially in later times, when economic activity had developed and the monarchy had become well established. Some of these, when belonging to the State and used for army and other public purposes, were of enormous size. They were circular, built of brick, and several of them were sometimes placed together in a particular quarter of a town. In most cases their upper structure has long since disappeared and only the lower courses remain, but they can be reconstituted by analogy with the Egyptian ones. The workers seem to have mounted a ladder and poured the grain through an opening on the top, and they withdrew it when needed through a little side-door almost level with the ground. The 'round houses' discovered by Garstang in the earliest level at Jericho (*c.* 3000–2500 B.C.) contained remains of various cereals, and were probably silos, as he suggests. In a previous article (Dec., 1940) we described the huge silo found at Beth-Shemesh and believed to date from the reign of David or Solomon. Another immense one, thirteen feet wide and over ten feet deep, has been discovered at Bethshean (*Beisan*), adjoining the 'migdol' of Amenophis III (*c.* 1400 B.C.). It probably contained grain for the garrison. The bottom is paved with clay tiles laid on basalt, and the capacity is estimated at more than 8800 imperial gallons. At *Tell Jemmeh* (believed to be

Gerar), in the Persian level, the remains of several large silos, from twenty to thirty feet in diameter, have been found. Some scholars regard these as the commissariat storehouses of an expeditionary force intended for Egypt, and Flinders Petrie considers that they would provide supplies for 35,000 men for two months (*Gerar*, pp. 8 ff.), but it is not improbable that we have here one of the large *entrepôts* of the Negeb, where the produce of the rich wheat fields of the plain were stored and centralized.

**4. The Grinding.**—This in all ages has been peculiarly the province of women (cf. Ec $12^3$ R.V.m., Mt $24^{41}$), one of the most important of their household duties, and a millstone has often been an effective weapon in their hands (cf. Jg $9^{53}$, 2 S $11^{21}$). In the houses of the wealthy the work fell to the female slaves (cf. Ex $11^5$), and it was often forced on male captives as a species of hard labour (cf. Samson, Jg $16^{21}$; King Zedekiah in Babylon, Jer $52^{11}$, Greek text; La $5^{13}$). The earliest, most primitive type of mill was the **rubbing-stone**, which simply consisted of a rectangular slab of hard stone, usually basalt, in size about two feet by one, on which the grain was placed (the slab was made somewhat concave for the purpose), along with an upper smaller stone (the muller or pestle) which was slightly convex on one side to fit into the lower one and had generally a groove on its upper side to facilitate gripping it. The woman, kneeling in front, moved the upper stone backwards and forwards over the grain. It is to these rudimentary mills that the Biblical texts allude when they speak of the 'lower millstone' (*pelaḥ taḥtith*, Job $41^{24}$) and the 'upper millstone' or 'stone of riding' (*pelaḥ rekeb*, Jg $9^{53}$ R.V., 2 S $11^{21}$ R.V.). The whole apparatus was sometimes known by the name of *ṭeḥôn* or *ṭaḥanah* (from *ṭāḥan* 'to grind'), cf. La $5^{13}$, Ec $12^4$, 'when the sound of the mill is low'; and occasionally it was referred to by a dual word *rêḥaïm* ('the two millstones'), cf. Ex $11^5$, Nu $11^8$, Dt $24^6$ R.V., Is $47^2$, etc. The mill being the means by which the family sustenance was provided was so indispensable to daily domestic life that the Hebrew creditor was forbidden to take it or any part of it in pledge, 'for he taketh the man's life to pledge' (Dt $24^6$). Some rectangular stone slabs found by Bliss and Macalister in the Shephelah and by the Harvard excavators at Samaria have been regarded by a few scholars as the frames of skylight windows, but an excellent example of a similar kind discovered at *Tell Ḥalaf* leaves no doubt that they were millstones.[1]

[1] Oppenheim (Wheeler), *Tell Ḥalaf*, 206 and pl. xlix. b.

In the course of the ages, by Hellenistic times at least, the quern or rotatory mill developed. This was an apparatus in which the stones were smaller (sometimes only about a foot across), and the upper one was rotated round a stem projecting from the centre of the lower one. At first, such as in some early Gezer specimens discovered, the upper stone had no handle for gripping it, but by and by it was made more effective by having an upright wooden peg for this purpose inserted near the outer edge, and the worker could thus rotate the stone through a complete circle. Such a mill could be operated by two women sitting at opposite sides, and each turning the stone through half a revolution (cf. Mt $24^{41}$).

### Shipping at Ugarit (Ras Shamra).

One of the most notable differences between the Israelites and the Phœnicians consists in the fact that the former were an agricultural people and the latter a maritime one. The former to a large extent were ignorant of navigation, largely owing to their nomadic training and the insufficiency and unsuitability of their coast-line (much of it being also in the possession of the Philistines). To most of the Israelites the sea, with its foam and fury, was a source of fear, a symbol of ruthless and overwhelming energy. They had no love for the mighty deep, and their writers never describe its beauty, only its resistless power and awful perils (cf. Ps $104^{25.\ 26}$ $107^{23-27}$, Wis $14^5$). The Phœnicians, however, whose territory was narrow and unsuited for agriculture (they had to import grain and oil, 1 K $5^{11}$), possessed a coast with good natural harbours and were a seafaring nation. Without any knowledge of the compass and guided mainly by the Little Bear (which the Greeks named Phoinikē, 'The Phœnician Star'), they ventured long distances over the Mediterranean and far beyond, and became the chief navigators of ancient times. One of the latest and most remarkable discoveries by Professor Schaeffer, of the French Archæological Expedition to Ras Shamra in Phœnicia, has been the existence of a war marine at the port adjoining this spot, as far back as the fourteenth or fifteenth century B.C. Here under the accumulated sands of over three millenniums he has uncovered ancient quays, port installations, vast depôts, foundries for copper ore (from Cyprus), and manufactories for utensils and implements. The captain of the port seems to have entered in a register the name of every ship arriving and departing. Several registers have been recovered, and over fifteen different types of ships are men-

tioned, including troop transports. Two vessels of war are entered, along with the name of the commander, the number of the crew (ninety), and the complement of guards and soldiers (comparable to modern marines). Ugarit was thus not only the commercial metropolis of Northern Syria, and a brilliant intellectual centre, but possessed a naval as well as a military organization, and all this long before the Israelites had entered Palestine under Joshua or had even left Egypt. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that the Israelites took little interest in navigation and were not enamoured of the sea, preferring their fields and crops, their sheep and cattle. Even Solomon's navy of ships from Ezion-geber had to be manned by Phœnician sailors, and the stones for the building of the Temple at Jerusalem had to be conveyed on rafts down the coast by the Phœnicians themselves (1 K $5^{9}$, 2 Ch $2^{16}$). It was not till the time of the Maccabees that the Jews formed their first actual seaport at Joppa (1 Mac $14^{5}$), modern Jaffa. It has very poor landing conditions, however, though most of the foreign trade of Palestine at the present day passes through this harbour. Within recent years a better harbour has been constructed at Haifa, where boats are independent of weather conditions. This new place of anchorage is now becoming the chief port of Palestine, and is in a position to compete with the largest ports on the Eastern Mediterranean.

### Old Testament Mythology.

Owing to the close association of the Israelites with neighbouring nations, their religion was largely affected in language, belief, and custom by foreign elements. Side by side with the Israelite outlook there were always complex external influences. Hence many Old Testament ideas, which appear rudimentary, mythical, and primitive, can best be explained by those of surrounding peoples. Two or three examples of what we refer to may be given here, though instances are innumerable:

(1) **God's Finger.**—The magicians of Egypt, in order to justify their incompetence, exclaimed in regard to Aaron's miracles, 'This is the finger of God' (Ex $8^{19}$). Similarly, the Israelite commandments are stated to have been 'written with the finger of God' (Ex $31^{18}$, Dt $10^{9}$), and the same idea is expressed in the appeal of Christ, 'If I by the finger of God cast out devils' (Lk $11^{20}$ R.V.). Light is thrown on this matter by a *sacrum* discovered in Egypt and consisting of a falcon's head, with a carved wooden finger springing from it. The head was an emblem of the gods Re and Horus, and was common on the oars and steering-posts of funeral boats, while the finger was a symbol of divine action, and in this wooden form was familiar in Egypt in ceremonial and magical acts. The Egyptian expression *dd ntru* ('The finger of God') is found in several papyri (see, *e.g.*, Papyrus 438 Boulaq).

(2) **Meals before God.**—We read that Aaron and the elders came to 'eat bread before God' (Ex $18^{12}$); that Moses and other great figures with him had a meal before God on the top of the mountain (Ex $24^{11}$, 'They saw God and did eat and drink'); and that the Israelite kings used to 'eat bread before Yahweh' at the gate of the Temple (Ezk $44^{3}$). This striking idea is explained by the mythology of North Syria. Ceremonial scenes of that region (Carchemish, Mar'ash, etc.) represent communal feasts with or before the gods, and in the inscription of King Panammu (*c.* 750 B.C.) on the statue of the god Hadad, the conception of feasting with the god is clearly referred to: 'May the soul of Panammu eat and drink with Hadad.' A close bond of union was believed to connect the members of a clan with their deity, and if a feast was being celebrated, there was united participation.

(3) **The Struggle with Dragons.**—Certain texts (such as Job $9^{13}$ R.V., $26^{12}$ R.V., Ps $87^{4}$ $89^{10}$, Is $30^{7}$ R.V., $51^{9, 10}$) speak of God overcoming Rahab, a mythological monster or dragon (=the Babylonian Tiamat) living in the depths of the sea. The thought is taken from the conflicts of gods with these fabulous reptiles, which is supposed to have taken place in primeval times, and especially the conflict of the Babylonian god Marduk with Tiamat. Probably the echoes of such conflicts can be traced in the story of Samson, as they can in the exploits of the far-famed Gilgamesh and the Egyptian god Bes. Gods, like hunters, were even supposed to trap their foes in nets (cf. Job $19^{6}$, 'God hath compassed me with his net'), and such nets are portrayed on the great stele of the Sumerian Eannatum, on the monolith of Sargon I. at Susa, and elsewhere.

(4) **The Winged Sun.**—In Mal $4^{2}$ the prophet speaks of the 'Sun of righteousness arising with healing in His wings,' and in connexion probably with the same idea there are numerous references to God's protecting wings under whose shadow men could take refuge (cf. Ps $17^{8}$ $36^{7}$ $57^{1}$ $61^{4}$ $91^{4}$). This widespread symbol of God in the form of a winged sun was a familiar one in ancient mythology. It has been found at Beth-shean and other places, and appears in various divergent forms. It originated in Assyria and Egypt, and was the peculiar symbol of Ashur, within which the god

himself is depicted leading his people in battle or protecting his chosen from evil. The seal of a Moabite ruler (Chemosh-zadak) pictures a four-winged deity, with an additional pair of wings in his hands.

(5) **Gods in Chariots.**—We read of Yahweh riding in a chariot on the clouds (Ps $104^3$), and being drawn (evidently in a chariot) by cherubim (1 Ch $28^{18}$). Also, at the entrance of the Temple at Jerusalem, in the days preceding the reformation of Josiah, there were chariots of the sun, no doubt dedicated to Yahweh (2 K $23^{11}$). The Old Testament even represents Yahweh as having chariots among His retinue, for we read of 'chariots and horses of deliverance' whereon He rode forth to terrify and vanquish Israel's foes in the days of the Exodus (Hab $3^{8\,f.}$). Cf. also the 'flying wheels' of Ezekiel's vision (chs. 1, 10), and the fiery chariots of 2 K $2^{11}$ $6^{17}$ $13^{14}$. These ideas are not poetical; their origin is entirely mythological. The deities were regarded as having their chariots. Shamash, the Babylonian sun-god, like the Helios of the Greeks, was represented as riding in this way; on the 'Standard of Ur' (an elaborate piece of mosaic unearthed by Woolley) the god-king's empty chariot is portrayed as drawn by four asses harnessed abreast, and a similar scene is represented on a stone bas-relief from Ur; and at Arslan Tepe (Anatolia) a Hittite god is pictured with a chariot in the form of an eagle. In nearly all Near Eastern religions the chariot was an indispensable accompaniment of divine monarchy.

(6) **Ladders to Heaven.**—The ladder which Jacob saw reaching from earth to heaven (Gn $28^{12}$) has been variously interpreted. Jacob, it is true, may have had in his mind the natural series of terraces, almost like rocky steps, on the hillside at Bethel, but the idea of a ladder reaching to the sky, where the abode of the gods was, is a familiar one in mythology. It is a very ancient conception, occurring long before Jacob's time, as early indeed as the Pyramid texts of Egypt (3000–4000 B.C.), where there is a high ladder—not a flight of stone steps—for the Pharaohs to reach the abode of the gods. The ladder was let down to them in answer to their prayers, and they were assisted to mount it without accident by the inhabitants of the other world. The picture of a vertical ladder is often found upon Neo-Babylonian seals and late Palestinian lamps, and is evidently meant to be symbolic of the ascent to heaven. The Babylonian ziggurat, which was really an approach to the gods, had a huge flight of steps leading to the shrine at the summit.

# In the Study.

## Virginibus Puerisque.

### In the Presence of Our Enemies.

A HARVEST FESTIVAL ADDRESS.

By the Reverend S. Greer, M.A., Ayr.

'Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies.'—Ps $23^5$.

There is a picture in this text. We see a man fleeing from his enemies. It is in the desert, and there seems no way of escape. Suddenly he catches sight of an Arab's tent some distance away. For this he makes with desperate speed, his pursuers hot upon his heels. If he can but touch the rope of the tent he is safe, for then he will be under the protection of the Arab. Gasping, he throws himself across the tent's threshold; now, by the laws of Arab hospitality, he is a guest, and none can touch him. Upon a mat his host spreads food for the fugitive, and though his enemies lour upon him he eats in security. A table is prepared before him in the presence of his enemies. That, said the Psalmist, is what God in His mercy has done for me. And we can to-day truthfully add, 'And for me too.'

We to-day eat every meal in the presence of threatening foes, but we eat it in safety. And that is of God's great mercy. For He has given us gallant seamen and courageous airmen to protect at the risk of their lives the sea-lanes by which our food is brought from other lands. And He has given us that great army of devoted toilers on the land labouring as never before to keep our larders full. Above and beyond all else He has given us again the yearly miracle of harvest. Yes, He prepares our table in the presence of our enemy.

Think how far back God's preparations go. If you had lived hundreds of thousands of years ago—

all alone in the world—you would have seen some marvellous sights: belching volcanoes sending forth rivers of lava, great ice-fields spreading across all our countryside, grinding down the rocks. And both the volcanoes and the glaciers were God's servants to make the soil fertile with lava dust and crunched-up rocks. God was beginning to set our table even then when only strange monsters roamed the earth and wallowed in the sea.

Think of our soil—what you call dirt. Only children and farmers think of it as highly as they ought! And you children only get into trouble for your love of it! Yet in this wonderful substance there is food to suit every taste which any of our crops may have. They don't, of course, all like the same things, any more than you do. But all of them live by it, and so God's good earth, with richness in it from the days of the volcanoes, has been preparing a table for us and food to eat.

To-day, then, all of us have come to Church to say 'Thank You' to God, and we have brought with us some of the things He has helped us and we have helped Him to grow. He gave the sun, the soil, the seed, and we did some of the rest of the job. When we work in the garden—it is one of the things that makes gardening so grand—we are working alongside God.

But also *we* have to do some careful planning ourselves, so that food may still be provided in the presence of our enemies. Every harvest is a preparation for the days ahead. The squirrels in the wood are hiding their hoard of nuts before they curl up and go to sleep. And did you know about the ants, those strange little creatures so wise in their ways? They chew up seeds into dough and make tiny biscuits of them as a winter store. And so our farmers are gathering their crops into barns, and wise folk in our homes are thinking how they can save food from being wasted, and planning how they can do without things which we don't really need, so that there may be no empty cupboards in the land. Some folk are very foolish, and do not think of the future, and do not count the price of things. But food to-day costs dear. It may cost men's lives.

There is another preparation for another harvest we must often think about. And that also is in the presence of a threatening foe. I mean provision, not for the things we eat, but for the thing we are. Every day we are putting aside something in the bank of Character, and the future will show what we have to draw upon. How can we make our future safe? Let me put it this way. You have been admiring the lovely colours of the trees in autumn, the beautiful russet and gold leaves. Where did they get all that glory? They drew it from the sun in the springtime and in the summer, and stored it up. That beauty did not come into the leaves at once. Secretly, all the day, the tree was gathering to itself all that loveliness, and now is giving it back to the world.

'Keep yourself in the light of the sun,' is the Tree's motto, and the Flower's motto. Through the sun they grow in strength and loveliness. 'Keep yourself in the love of Christ' is the Christian's motto. If we open up our life to Him and walk in His way, something of what He was—His strength, His gentleness, His love—will pass into our character. Evil things may threaten us, temptation beset us, but if we keep close to Him they can never harm us.

---

## The Cowardly Brother.

By the Reverend John Wilding, B.A., King's Norton.

'A bruised reed shall he not break.'—Mt $12^{20}$.

For every thousand people who have heard the name of Sir Walter Scott it would be hard to find one person who knows the name of his brother Daniel. In fact, if Sir Walter had had his way at one time of his life we should never have known that Daniel Scott was his brother, for he was bitterly ashamed of him.

The reason for that shame was this. Daniel was a wild and worthless youth, and he was often in trouble. So much so that at last arrangements were made for him to leave the country and to settle in the West Indies. There Daniel went from bad to worse, but his brother Walter kept in touch with him until the following news reached home. There had been a negro rebellion in the islands, and Daniel had played the coward and had run away. That his brother would not forgive. Daniel came home, but Walter would not see him. If there was occasion to speak of Daniel, Walter would not say 'my brother,' but 'my relative.' When Daniel died, Walter refused even to go to the funeral or to show any signs of mourning. His heart remained hardened.

But not for ever. Years later Sir Walter Scott wrote a book called *The Fair Maid of Perth* in which he described a character like his dead brother Daniel, one called Conachar, who played the coward. And the interesting thing to see is that Sir Walter excuses and justifies the coward. When a friend spoke to him about this, Scott referred to his harsh treatment of young Daniel, and he said, 'I have now learned to have more toleration and compassion than I had in those days.'

This story is a reminder to us to be tolerant to those who in these trying days may not be so brave or so strong as we. When our Lord had to deal with the weak and the fearful He did not show the harshness of a Walter Scott. It was said of Him that He would not break the bruised reed, that men and women who were weak would not be dismissed by Him, but tenderly treated that they might grow strong. The most beautiful instance of this is the way in which Jesus went on loving and trusting Peter after Peter had denied Him on the night before the Crucifixion. Surrounded by His Master's enemies Peter failed to stand by his Friend, said hotly that he did not know Him, and was ashamed to own his Lord. But when they met again, the Risen Lord spoke encouraging words to Peter and gave to him the task of looking after the other disciples. 'Feed my sheep,' He said.

By the harsh treatment of his brother Daniel, Sir Walter Scott only did him harm and did himself no good. By His gentleness with Peter our Lord made a better and a stronger man of him, and He showed to us how we may best help and not hurt those whose courage fails them. It is easy to push such people down: it is work for a Christian to lift them up.

## The Christian Year.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

### Barren Harvests.

BY THE REVEREND REGINALD E. WHITE, B.D.,
TAFFS WELL, CARDIFF.

'Although the fig tree shall not blossom; neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls: yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation.'—Hab $3^{17, 18}$.

While Benjamin Franklin was American Ambassador in Paris he was often derided for his reverence of the Bible, until at length he resolved to test his critics' knowledge of the Book they scoffed at. At a dinner he read to them part of an ancient and superb poem which he professed to have discovered. It was greeted with enthusiasm, and with demands to know the origin and author of so exquisite a fragment. With delight Franklin revealed it to be the closing words of the Book of Habakkuk, to their great confusion.

The words are indeed fine poetry, but they enshrine an even finer confession of religious faith and certainty, a joyous, radiant trust in the providence of God hardly to be paralleled in the whole Bible.

Perhaps the poetic form and oriental setting dull something of the Prophet's meaning for our prosaic Western minds: remember that figs and vines and olives and crops provided the work and the wealth of the Israelite, and try to translate the poet's thought into our terms: 'though the factories stand idle and the mines are deserted, though gardens and fields are barren and the shops are empty; though business fails, work ceases and health and home are taken from us—yet will we rejoice in the Lord: though my world totter around me and my security perish overnight, yet will I joy in the God of my salvation.' Something like that reflects Habakkuk's spirit, and singles out his great confession as the high-water mark of one kind of religion.

For there is an opposite kind of religion, even in the Bible. The religion of Jacob, 'IF God will be with me, and keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace, THEN shall the Lord be my God.' Such was really the attitude too of Job's friends, who saw in his calamities a certain proof that Job was not a godly man—for what was godliness for but to insure against adversity? Such an attitude is symbolized in the crowd who followed Jesus for the sake of the loaves and fishes, and reaches a tragic climax in the betrayal of Jesus. For Judas too expected discipleship to bring him worldly rewards in the shape of position in the coming Kingdom; it was his realization that Christ's Kingdom involved rather the opposite that kindled his resentment and prompted the treachery. But such self-seeking religion did not end with Judas: a prayer ascribed to the M.P. for Weymouth, in 1727, expresses the same attempt to use faith in God for purely worldly ends. He prayed, 'O Lord, Thou knowest that I have nine houses in the city of London, and that I have lately purchased an estate in Essex; I beseech Thee to preserve the two counties of Middlesex and Essex from fires and earthquakes.' Such is an extreme example of Jacob-religion, the love of God for what we can get out of Him, the loyalty to Him that is conditional on His coming up to our expectations. To such a kind of faith adversity constitutes a fatal problem: at the first breath of trouble such religion dissolves into unbelief. It is to such faith that war, with its terrible harvest of personal suffering, proves so great a difficulty—and yet it is amid the dangers and uncertainties of war that this superstitious, self-seeking religion appeals to many people.

We do well, I think, to remember, especially in a

harvest service, when we come to offer our worship and thanksgiving to God the Bountiful Giver, that, though we feel our heart's gratitude and love stimulated by the memory of His great goodness to us, yet it is not for His material gifts, not for ease and plenty and security that we love Him, but for something deeper—for something that would make us love Him, trust Him, rejoice in Him, even though the barns were empty and the stalls deserted. We do well to remind ourselves that there is a higher, nobler religion than Jacob's, that of our poet-prophet. The Bible describes varying degrees of this purer faith—that of the Psalmist who in adversity will cling to God, though pouring out his complaints; that of Job, who will cling to God amid calamity with silent uncomplaining doggedness; saying, 'though he slay me yet will I trust him'; that of Paul who will cling to God, believing that 'all things work together for good.' But even Paul does not rise higher than Habakkuk, who in adversity will cling to his God, radiantly, joyfully, though he has no explanation to lean upon and none to offer. Surely this is true, unselfish, unseeking faith and love, such as alone can prompt true worship, or give real peace, or sustain unchanging loyalty.

To worship God at harvest-time, and thank Him for His gifts is right, and fine: but to be able to thank Him for Himself, and worship just as devoutly when the gifts are slow in coming, as Habakkuk did, is finer still. In E. Tegla Davies' short story a poor Welsh farmer, Samuel Jones, finds himself out of tune with the harvest thanksgivings of his wealthy neighbours. They can decorate the little chapel with a proud display of fruit and vegetables that told of very successful farming: he had only meagre crops wrested from sun-starved, weed-choked land that paid ill for his hard toil. One year the bitterness was too sharp, and he resolved not to attend on Sunday; but a night of heart-searching prayer brought a new insight. Early on Sunday morning he went to the church, and replaced the glorious display with his own nettles, docks, thistles, brambles. At service time the congregation was dumb, the singing poor, the pray-ers silenced. How could men see God's face or His goodness in thistles, weeds, brambles, gorse? Men who long had worshipped God for His bounty found they could not praise Him in lean and difficult times. But Samuel Jones, with his new insight into the meaning of real worship, took charge and read, with his soul in every word, the great confession of Habakkuk, and led the congregation in a prayer that is still remembered by all who heard. To pray thus, to praise thus, when the gifts are slow in coming, and hard to win—this is sincere worship, the love of God for Himself.

Such unseeking, unconditioned faith as Habakkuk's is the secret of peace, too. Taking no thought for 'these things' because our heavenly Father knoweth we have need of them, is the Master's own prescription for peace of mind amid insecurity and anxiety. Paul says he had learned its truth, having discovered how, in whatsoever state he was, therein to be content. Only when we reach the point where we let God do what He will about the vines and figs, and stalls, about ourselves, our homes, our loved ones, can we ever taste the peace that passes knowledge, but not experience.

Finally, only a trust of the quality of Habakkuk's will keep our love and loyalty constant and unswerving in days of loss and danger, of poor harvests and discouraging results. Thomas à Kempis says: 'The true heart regardeth, not the gift of the lover, but the love of the giver.' That is the secret of constancy. We are reminded of Shakespeare's 'Love is not love which alters when it alteration finds.' Not, it is true, that we ever find alteration in God, but His ways with us often appear to change from smile to frown, from blessing to discipline, from full barns and rich gifts to leaner, sterner times. But if we love Him for Himself, and trust His ways, then we shall go on serving, go on doing His will whether He gives or withholds, smiles or hides His face. A shallower love will pass through moods, now enthusiastic, now cool: but faith and love like Habakkuk's are unchanging. His joy in God is the secret of constancy, as of peace and praise. Let us thank Him then for His gifts, but *love* Him for Himself.

---

## Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.

### St. Matthew's Day.

By the Very Reverend J. S. MacArthur, B.D., M.A., The College, Millport.

'They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick.'—Mt $9^{12}$ (R.V.).

These words follow closely on the account of how our Lord called Matthew the publican to be one of His disciples. The incident is very briefly narrated. We are informed that our Lord saw a publican named Matthew sitting at his place of business, that He bade him follow Him, whereupon Matthew arose and followed Him. It was a bold act on the part of a religious leader to invite a publican to join the band of His disciples and one that would compromise

His reputation in the eyes of many. Compare the publicans with the Quislings who accept office under the Nazi rule in the invaded countries and you will have some idea of how they were regarded by the decent people of Palestine in our Lord's time. Not only were they renegades, but the conditions of their employment as tax-collectors under the Roman government gave them many opportunities of making money in underhand ways by various kinds of petty fraud and extortion.

It was to this class of men that Matthew belonged, and one of his first acts after joining our Lord was to give a party to which many of his former associates were invited. To sit down to a meal in such questionable company was a test of the loyalty of the other disciples, but they did not fail. They may have been puzzled by this new addition that their Master had made to the Apostolic band, but if so, they kept their doubts to themselves. Or it may have been that they were able to recognize the deep sense of vocation that lay behind Matthew's immediate acceptance of their Master's call. He had done what they too had done, and yet in a way he had done more, for discipleship meant for Matthew a more irrevocable break with the past than it did for them. For the other disciples there was always the possibility of going back to their fishing if discipleship proved to be a failure, and indeed there is just a hint in the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel that even after the Resurrection some of them did think of going back to the old life. But for Matthew such a return would have been all but impossible.

Whether the disciples saw this or not, they seem to have accepted Matthew without question, but there were critics. The Pharisees murmured at one who claimed to be a man of God associating with people who had not the entry to God-fearing society. To estimate a man's character or the principles that he professes is a troublesome task and one that may take up a good deal of time and attention, but you can at once see who his friends are, what sort of company he keeps, and birds of a feather flock together. That was probably how the Pharisees reasoned, and often enough that way of sizing up people serves quite well. But not always.

Jesus' reply was a crushing one: They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. He makes no attempt to whitewash the morals of the company He is in, but He points out that the physician must go where He is needed. Others may be afraid of the risk of infection and keep out of its way, but the physician must face it.

It is pedantry to suppose that our Lord recognized a class of righteous people who were 'whole' and had no need of Him. When He says that He came, not to call the righteous, but sinners, He is ironically echoing the words of His critics. For the moment He accepts their classification of mankind into sinners and righteous. But will they see the point of His irony? Even now, do we see it? Would these Pharisees have claimed to be righteous and in no need of repentance? Probably not. In theory they would have admitted that they were sinners and that they needed to repent of their sins. They may even have made some kind of formal acknowledgment of their sins in their prayers, but their sins were the sins of respectable people, in quite a different category from the kind of wrongdoing that brands men as sinners. And yet in the sight of God those respectable sins are just as deadly as the more lurid misdeeds for which men are called vicious.

Chief among those respectable sins is pride. That is what we forget when we speak of having a proper pride and regard it as a kind of spiritual asset. Indeed it was just this proper pride that lay behind the Pharisees' criticism, and it is this proper pride that underlies all snobbishness. It is this same proper pride that masquerades as honour and sets nation against nation.

It is not for nothing that pride heads the list of the seven capital sins, or the seven deadly sins, as they are sometimes wrongly called. It is worth while being accurate in this, for when we speak of the seven deadly sins we are apt to think that there are only seven sins that are deadly, and that if we avoid these we are in fairly good spiritual health. That is precisely the state of mind of those Pharisees. No, the idea behind the title of the seven capital sins is that they are the seven fountain-head sins to which all others can be traced. They are pride, gluttony, sloth, covetousness, anger, lust, and envy. All these fountain-head sins may take 'respectable' forms, but for 'respectability,' and therefore for danger, pride heads the list.

I believe that the reason why pride heads the list of the seven capital sins is that it makes penitence difficult. More than any of the rest it anæsthetizes the conscience. The victim of pride does not know that he needs the physician. He may confess with his lips that he is a miserable sinner, but he has no genuine sense of sin.

The Church has always insisted on the necessity of a sense of sin as a condition of the Christian life, and she has been criticised for this. It has seemed to many that the note of penitence in her liturgy and offices is forced and exaggerated, but in this she is true to the teaching of her Lord who came to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, who

came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance.

To insist on the reality and potency of sin is not morbid. What is morbid is the refusal to recognize it for what it is, to act as though it were an illusion or at best an old-fashioned label for various ways of behaving that can be described by much more pleasantly-sounding names. But to ignore sin only increases its power to wreck human life and happiness.

Could any one look at the world to-day and say that it was whole and had no need of the physician, that it was righteous and could not be expected to listen to the call to repentance? Bitter affliction, whether it comes to an individual, to a nation, or to the world, is like the pain that draws attention to the disease that it had been possible to ignore, but just as pain in itself will not cure disease, so affliction will not of itself work salvation. The physician must be called in, and his orders must be obeyed.

In His incarnate life our Lord came to call sinners to repentance, and through His Church He still calls them. Throughout her acts of worship that call still sounds. Let us not imagine, like the Pharisees, that our 'respectable' sins stand in no need of the physician.

Nay but much rather let me late returning
Bruised of my brethren, wounded from within,
Stoop with sad countenance and blushes burning,
Bitter with weariness and sick with sin,—

Straight to Thy presence get me and reveal it,
Nothing ashamed of tears upon Thy feet,
Show the sore wound and beg Thine hand to heal it,
Pour Thee the bitter, pray Thee for the sweet.

Then with a ripple and a radiance thro' me
Rise and be manifest, O Morning Star!
Flow on my soul, thou Spirit, and renew me,
Fill with Thyself, and let the rest be far.[1]

---

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

## God's Way and Man's Waywardness.

BY THE REVEREND CYRIL A. GELL, GREAT HALLINGBURY, BISHOP'S STORTFORD.

'The Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet.'—Nah $1^3$.

The prophets of Israel were men who were in close touch with Nature, that is to say they studied Nature, but not in the modern sense of the word. They did not examine Nature, as does the scientist of to-day, and seek to discover her secrets and methods of operation. The secret of Nature for them was God, and her workings the operation of His mind. It was not Nature as such which interested them but the God who was behind—the God of whom Nature was but a mode of expression. So that if we want to get at the prophetic view of Nature we must go to the poets not to the scientists. When, in what Carlyle calls the thunder speech of the Earth Spirit, Nature is described as the living visible garment of God, the point of view is very similar to that of the Hebrew seers.

'Tis thus at the roaring loom of Time I ply
And weave for God the garment thou seest Him by.

Especially is this true when they were confronted with the cataclysmic events in Nature. The earthquake and the storm, which filled their minds with an excited awe at the output of tremendous force, were not so much the evidence as the symbols of divine power. In contrast with the turbulent sea which was a picture of the unrest and tumult of the nations, the everlasting hills showed forth the steadfastness and imperturbable strength of the Eternal Being Himself, and so on.

It was the being of God which these manifestations revealed. Nature was not merely a symbol but a sacrament. The magnificent language of the text is an instance. 'The Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet.' Here you have first the thought of one who moved on his irresistible way, and the motion of whose going was a cyclone, as his feet spurned the whirling clouds like dust. And secondly you have behind that the deeper thought, that in the political and moral tempests of the world, there is still the undeviating purpose of God persisting through, and making nothing of, the vicissitudes of time.

It is upon this point that I wish to fasten.

The Lord hath His way despite, nay rather, in and through all the madness, confusion, and turbulence of men and affairs.

That was the teaching of the tempest to the Hebrew seer. Let us not forget it.

The storm and whirlwind may seem chaotic in their violence and fury. All things go down before them. They leave waste and desolation in their wake. What was before a vista of calm and peaceful homesteads, of smiling pastures and flowering crops, becomes a desolation. It all seems so meaningless and senseless, and yet, as we know, some purposes are being fulfilled thereby. The very sternness of

[1] F. W. H. Myers, *St. Paul.*

the calamity calls into being qualities of courage and designs of reconstruction. Men re-build the ruined places and re-plant the ravaged fields. An indomitable spirit manifests itself, and out of the very chaos a new world arises. Over against the destruction caused by the storm an integrating spirit comes into play, and makes good the loss and damage in a thousand ways. So also in the moral and political order—the tempests of conflict and the unleashed forces of evil, which are so destructive of all that was so fair, the shattering of old standards of conduct, and traditions of thought and feeling, which had made of life a gracious thing, are used of God to build anew. The ruins of the past are God's quarries for the future. So He 'fulfils Himself in many ways lest one good custom should corrupt the world.' The process is painful. But all changes do not come in this fashion. Change which transforms the landscape is always going on in Nature.

By the peaceful agency of sun and rain, frost and watercourses, whole ranges of wild and rugged hills are reduced to the gentleness of undulating slopes and slowly moving streams. But these are not so noticeable as Nature's wilder moods. It is the cyclone, the earthquake, and the storm which frighten and dismay, and yet here also the Lord has His way.

And so again it is with the moral and political order; it is the periods of revolutionary change which stand out conspicuously. Forgotten are the gradual transitions, the broadening down from precedent to precedent which mark an orderly continuous process. It is the times of wars and tumults that arrest attention as they shake the world to its foundations.

It is in such a time that we are living to-day, and there is needed some great reinforcement of the spirit if our souls are not to become paralyzed by the shock of catastrophic events. Such a reinforcement is to be found in the conviction which lies behind the text. It is the man who, seeing all the vast turmoil of the tempest, can still say, 'The Lord hath his way,' who will be able to face it undismayed. So once more we come to belief in the power and purpose of God. And we must simply just make up our minds about it. Either God has His way in the whirlwind and the storm or He has not. If He has not, then we have power without purpose which is a nightmare of chaos. But if He has, then He can and will overrule all for His glory. But it is His way that is to be fulfilled, not ours. When our ways are His ways then there is tranquillity. But when men's ways diverge from His, then there is confusion and strife and the strife is of man's making not of His. But even so His way is irresistible. That is the salient certainty. God's will is going to be done whatever men may do, and which is more, *they* are going to contribute to its performance even when set on their own pursuits. Consider the course of events. After the last war a vision of fellowship was given to the nations. Men saw its possibilities and its splendour. Surely it was God's will and God's way. But they did not accept it. Each little State must have its own exclusive system and walk in its own way regardless of others. With their customs and tariffs, their racial feuds and jealousies, they disregarded the larger issues of the vision. When the whirlwind came they thought by declaring neutrality to escape. But in vain: one after the other they were swept away. Under the blitzkreig they were forced into a fellowship, but it was a fellowship of suffering, and it is in fellowship, brought about by man's own frowardness though it be, that the hope of the future lies. Again in our own land sections of the population lived their lives apart. They ignored God's way and His intention that men should realize their brotherhood. They went their own way. Then came the storm and they were forced to fuse. Classes and masses under the rain of bombs have been brought together, sharing the same roof, reduced to the same rations, rubbing shoulders with one another and mingling in a manner hitherto inconceivable. What caused this? The fury of the storm. Did God make the storm? Certainly not, but He has had His way in it, and is using the man-made storm to bring home the essential brotherhood of man to man. So one might go on, but enough has been said. Let there be no mistake. The course of this world is ordered by a higher intelligence than ours. Men may reject that ordering and go their own way. But the disorder which they create is still within God's higher ordering. That is our hope and confidence. Lose that hope and confidence, and all is lost. Hold it, and we can face the future knowing that there is not only a divinity which shapes our ends, but an ordering which is informed by love as well as power.

---

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

### The Larger Joy.

'And herein is that saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth.'—Jn $4^{37}$.

It is a true saying, some agree, but they repeat it cynically or bitterly: One does sow and another person reaps the fruit or fame of it. We know how

some resent it as a real hardship, that those who have borne the heat and burden of the day should not enjoy the honour of seeing it crowned with success. And yet that may fall to others, in this unequal world of ours. Like the bee with the honey, some make efforts which apparently go to enrich others, who either inherit or appropriate the results of toil endured by their predecessors. Of Sir Robert Peel it was said that he had the faculty of stamping himself on movements and measures in politics for which others were really responsible. 'On almost all the great measures with which his name is associated: on the Corn Laws, on the currency, on the amelioration of the criminal code, on Catholic emancipation, he was not one of the earliest labourers or quickest converts. He did not bear the heat and burden of the day; other men laboured, and he entered into their labours.' The pioneer must often yield in fame and name to one who puts the finishing stroke to what is already more than half completed. His work is a memory, if it is even that, as the reapers gather in the harvest of his toils.

But Jesus does not speak with any bitterness. *He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal: that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together. And herein is that saying true, One soweth and another reapeth.* The proverb holds true here, He means; but in the deeper sense that the sower shares the reaper's joy, though the joy differs; *herein* means the spiritual sphere of common labour for the ends of God on earth. And to both sower and reaper the encouragement He offers is that there is a joy larger than personal gratification.

Personal success is not everything. Both sower and reaper in the moral and religious sphere may know that they are contributing to a long, sure process. In Nature and providence there is a continuity which links together the efforts of all, rendering each of us dependent upon the labours of our predecessors and making us contribute to posterity. Each of us is in a real sense debtor to the ages. Every one with a life honestly and honourably lived is putting something into the general progress of the race. We may have the consolation of knowing that not only are we drawing upon the contributions of the past but also helping to prepare a future which we may not live to see. Much of our work, indeed, is humdrum and ordinary. But there are two thoughts which may well control us when we are endeavouring to bear what is laid upon us, or to do what is assigned us, without being selfish—gratitude for the past and a sense of responsibility for the future. As Jesus knew, we need to be lifted above the level of our personal feelings and narrow interests into the larger faith that every single life is an effect and also a cause, drawing upon yesterday and stretching forward into to-morrow, transmitting by its active and quiet faithfulness something that will live and thrive.

> Others, I doubt not, if not we,
> The issue of our toil shall see;
> Young children gather as their own
> The harvest that the dead have sown—
> The dead, forgotten and unknown.

Is it not so? Must we not learn to be brave and take long views, recalling that we are part of a great and growing order of things, needed by God for ends far beyond our sight and grasp, and equipped for such insight as we have by what previous generations have done for us in their day?

Our freedom and faith to-day we owe to the sacrifices of the past, made by people who worked under difficulties. What we enjoy has been prepared for us by men and women who once set their faces and bore hardship that such precious gifts might be ours. We should remember that more often than we do. We are reaping knowledge and health. We are enjoying opportunities, wielding energies of mind and body all our own. We stride ahead. We swing our arms with freedom. Yes, but we are reaping what others sowed, some of them even before we were born.

That is one side of the truth. The other is that we are sowers no less than reapers. It is part of our discipline to think of posterity, not as a time when our merits will be recognized, but as a season which requires to-day our self-denial and economy for its larger growth. Far off it may make a difference to some here whether you and I have been honest in our work and unselfish in our outlook. There are occasions upon which, in making up our minds to some choice or decision, we must keep the interests of the next generation in view. Often in history the tragedy is that what others have to reap is little more than the untoward results of a policy into which their seniors allowed themselves to drift, without taking sufficient heed to the possible outcome of their action or inaction. On the other hand, a faithful life is one of the thousand contributions to some purpose of God which is being carried on from age to age; the example and the memory of it last on, binding others to truth and goodness.

*One soweth.* It is an unexciting, unromantic business. In the weeks of late winter or early spring the sower plods over the wet, cold earth, throwing his seeds carefully upon the soil, not expecting any

immediate return, but sure that one day something will come of his labour. No wonder Jesus used that metaphor for influence, calling us to drop our seeds of duty and loyalty into the field of Time and to leave the ultimate results to God, taking care only that the seed is sound, and believing that our life will tell for good beyond what we may ever ourselves see or know. Another may reap? What of that, so long as our work is not thrown away? And the Lord guarantees that it will not be wasted. In this field of time God has something growing and ripening *unto eternal life*. We must believe that, and for the present make it our duty to live and work with that in view. Such is the sower's large, generous joy.

It means a far vision, but in the sphere of human influence quick returns are rarely possible; our call is to a patient continuance in well-doing. In rifle-shooting you know at once whether you have hit the mark or missed it; but as a rule it is different with the impact of one life upon another. Teachers especially can understand the force of this truth. They put what they can into the lives of the young; yet the young leave them, sometimes not apparently impressed by what they have been given. Well, the teacher must exercise faith that the training and teaching, so far as it has been genuine, will come out afterwards. It is not surprising that the great lines upon this faith in a growing purpose were written by a schoolmaster, by Thring of Uppingham:

> My brothers, 'neath the eternal Eyes
> One human joy shall touch the just—
> To know their spirit's heirs shall rise
> And lift their purpose from the dust.
> The father's passion arms the son,
> And the great deed goes on, goes on.

That may sound too high for our reach. Our lives may appear so commonplace and uninfluential that it seems absurd to connect them with any great purpose. But we are called to be sowers in the sense that every life is bound to do work that goes beyond ourselves. To be self-denying, to be dutiful in the relationships and responsibilities of life, may not appear to matter very much; but it does matter much if we are thus careful and strict about the nearest duty, for every honest effort goes into the purpose of the living God, helping to create an atmosphere of faith, to maintain a tradition of simple goodness, and, it may well be, to incline others after us to believe in the God whom we have been seeking to commend by our faithfulness.

*One soweth and another reapeth.* Christ summons us to this unselfish courage of taking thought for to-morrow, to an act of faith that it will matter some day if we to-day live by the inclination of the moment and think most of gratifying our personal desires, or if we take the nobler line. Our labour in the Lord is not in vain. Now and then you can see that. But often you can only foresee it, and in such hours it is a peace of soul to believe that, in spite of appearances, your homely service may be needed somehow for the ripening process of God among men, to help the gain and joy and health of some who are to come after you and who, apart from what you do, cannot be made perfect in their faith. Enough for us—say this to yourselves—

> Enough, if something from our hands have power
> To live and act and serve the future hour.[1]

[1] J. Moffatt, *His Gifts and Promises*, 147.

# Jesus' Questions and Ours.

By the Reverend T. F. Glasson, M.A., B.D., Newcastle, Staffs.

Questions figure prominently in the life of Jesus. One of the earliest glimpses we have of Him reveals Him as a boy 'sitting in the midst of the doctors . . . asking them questions.' They were questioning Him too, for the story continues, 'they were amazed at his understanding and his answers.'

In His later life He was still asking and answering questions. On numerous occasions *He answered one question by asking another*, and the frequency of this method is surprising. The following list is not intended to be exhaustive, but here are twenty instances:

1. Mt $12^{10.\ 11}$. They asked Him, 'Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day?'

   He replied with a question: 'What man shall there be of you, that shall have one sheep, and if this fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out?'

2. Mt $15^{2.3}$. 'Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders?'

He answered with a question: 'Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?'

3. Mt $19^{3.4}$. 'Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?'

Jesus replied with a question: 'Have ye not read, that he which made them, etc. . . . ?'

4. Mt $21^{16}$. The chief priests said: 'Hearest thou what these are saying?'

Jesus replied: 'Yea; did ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes, etc. . . . ?'

5. Mk $2^{7-9}$. 'Who can forgive sins but one, even God?'

Jesus: 'Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise, and walk?'

6. Mk $2^{18.19}$. 'Why do John's disciples fast . . . but thy disciples fast not?'

Jesus: 'Can the sons of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?'

7. Mk $6^{37.38}$. 'Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread?'

Jesus: 'How many loaves have ye?'

8. Mk $8^{4.5}$. 'Whence shall one be able to fill these men with bread here in a desert place?'

Jesus: 'How many loaves have ye?'

9. Mk $9^{11.12}$. 'And they asked him, saying, The scribes say that Elijah must first come.'

Jesus: '. . . how is it written of the Son of man, etc. . . . ?'

10. Mk $10^{17.18}$. 'Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?'

Jesus: 'Why callest thou me good?'

11. Mk $11^{28-30}$. 'By what authority doest thou these things?'

'And Jesus said unto them, I will ask of you one question, and answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men? answer me.'

12. Mk $12^{14-16}$. 'Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?'

Jesus: '. . . Whose is this image and superscription?'

13. Lk $6^{2.3}$. 'Why do ye that which it is not lawful to do on the sabbath day?'

Jesus: 'Have ye never read what David did, when he was an hungred . . . ?'

14. Lk $10^{25.26}$. 'Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?'

Jesus: 'What is written in the law? how readest thou?'

15. Lk $10^{29-36}$ (later in the same incident), 'And who is my neighbour?'

Jesus answered with a parable, ending with a question, 'Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbour unto him that fell among the robbers?'

16. Lk $12^{41.42}$. Peter: 'Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us . . . ?'

Jesus: 'Who then is the faithful and wise steward . . . ?'

17. Jn $3^{9.10}$. Nicodemus: 'How can these things be?'

Jesus: 'Art thou the teacher of Israel, etc. . . . ?'

18. Jn $8^{25}$. 'Who art thou?'

Jesus: 'How is it that I even speak to you at all?' (R.V. margin). (Moffatt has: 'Why should I talk to you at all?')

19. Jn $18^{33.34}$. Pilate: 'Art thou the King of the Jews?'

Jesus answered, 'Sayest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee concerning me?'

20. Jn $21^{21.22}$. Peter: 'Lord, and what shall this man do?'

Jesus: 'If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me.'

Some of these instances are concerned with the critics of Jesus and others with earnest inquirers and disciples, but with both classes He used the same method. The Johannine examples are not as striking as the rest, but it is surely significant that the Fourth Gospel shows the same characteristic.

Jesus' treatment of questioners in Mk 11–12 makes an interesting study, especially $12^{34}$. No wonder that 'after that no man durst ask him any question.' They had come with their confident queries to test Jesus, and discovered that He was really testing them—not in theology but character. The queue of inquirers slowly melted away. Pilate too (Jn 18 quoted above, No. 19) thought he was examining Jesus and was disconcerted to find that Jesus was examining him.

(One is reminded of Job who at first had plenty of questions to put to the Almighty, *e.g.* $23^{3-5}$:

'I would fill my mouth with arguments.
I would know the words which he would answer me.'

When at last he came into the divine presence he found that God had some questions for him (38–41) —four chapters of them!)

We may include here *the indirect replies of Jesus*. The answer He gave to John the Baptist was far more convincing than a plain 'Yes' (Mt $11^{2-6}$).

'Lord, are there few that be saved?' asked an inquirer. He must have been surprised and shaken by the reply of Jesus, 'Strive to enter in by the narrow door . . .' Instead of an interesting piece of theological information came a personal call to repentance (Lk $13^{23.\ 24}$). How penetrating too were the words to the Samaritan woman: 'The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come all the way hither to draw. Jesus saith unto her, Go, call thy husband, and come hither' (Jn $4^{15.\ 16}$; see also Mk $10^{37.\ 38}$ and Lk $7^{39-43}$).

In *the normal teaching of Jesus* questions figured prominently. For an illustration of this fact one may turn to the Sermon on the Mount. Every chapter yields several examples:—

Mt $5^{13}$. 'If the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?'

„ $5^{46.\ 47}$. 'For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the Gentiles the same?'

„ $6^{25-28}$. 'Is not the life more than the food, and the body than the raiment? Behold the birds. . . . Are not ye of much more value than they? And which of you by being anxious can add one cubit unto his stature? And why are ye anxious concerning raiment?'

„ $6^{30}$. 'But if God so clothe the grass of the field . . . shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?'

„ $7^{3.\ 4}$. 'And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, etc. . . .?'

„ $7^{9-11}$. 'Or what man is there of you, who, if his son shall ask him for a loaf, will give him a stone, etc. . . .?'

„ $7^{16}$. 'Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?'

Confining our attention for the moment to the First Gospel, we may easily find other occasions when Jesus taught men by questioning them, Mt $16^{26}$ $17^{25}$ $18^{12}$ $23^{17}$. The turning point of His ministry was marked by the question at Caesarea Philippi, Mt $16^{13}$. (Even after the Resurrection He was still asking questions! see Lk $24^{26.\ 38}$, Jn $21^{15}$.)

Jesus clearly used this method in order to make men think for themselves, to set them on the road of finding their own answers, so that His truth was not something foreign imposed upon them from without but became the natural growth of their own thought, a structure reared on their own foundations. Every wise teacher knows it is better to stimulate the pupil's mind to make his own discoveries than merely to pour into it a lot of information.

The Feeding of the Five Thousand illustrates the principle which Jesus followed. Mk $6^{37-38}$ (quoted above, No. 7): 'How many loaves have ye?' He didn't provide the meal out of nothing; He began with what they had. It was small but He made that the foundation. It was the same with the hunger of the questioning mind; He seemed to say, 'Go and see what you can muster yourself by way of an answer first; in the face of this problem, how many loaves have you?' He always set men doing something for themselves, however helpless they seemed. 'Go and wash in Siloam.' 'Show yourself to the priest.'

A parasite obtains food without working for it; the dodder and the tape-worm simply get nourishment from some healthy organism without doing any work themselves. Now, Jesus was determined that His disciples should not be spiritual parasites. He did not give them simple truth ready to be absorbed, but He presented it in such a way that they had to work for it and make it their own. He taught in parables not to simplify, but to provide an enigmatic covering which kept the truth from the careless and preserved it for the earnest. Those who took the trouble of working their way through the shell found the real meaning, and the truth dawned on them with all the freshness of a personal discovery.

It is interesting to compare His method with that of Socrates, who also taught men by asking questions. He had little positive teaching of his own but went about as an embodied mark of interrogation, and men learned more by the questions of Socrates (as they still can to-day) than from many volumes of information. He maintained that, like his mother, 'the burly Phaenarete,' he was really a mid-wife; he helped other men to bring their own thoughts to birth.[1] He would say in his ironical way that he had no ideas of his own, but by his questions he

[1] That this conceit is not a Platonic embellishment is shown by Aristophanes' *Clouds* (135–7), where a member of Socrates' 'mind-factory' says:

> ἀμαθής γε νὴ Δί' ὅστις οὑτωσὶ σφόδρα
> ἀπεριμερίμνως τὴν θύραν λελάκτικας
> καὶ φροντίδ' ἐξήμβλωκας ἐξηυρημένην.

could urge other minds to produce theirs. (See the famous passage *Theaetetus*, 150 B–D.)

A fascinating section of the *Meno* tells how Socrates one day calls a slave boy, and drawing a square on the ground asks him to draw one twice as big. The boy draws a side twice as long as that of the original square and then finds that this square is four times as big. Socrates keeps on questioning him and making adroit remarks until finally the boy discovers that a square on the diagonal has twice the area. Socrates turns triumphantly to his friends and points out that he has told the boy nothing; he found it out himself and must have known all along; the truth was already buried in his soul and only needed liberating, for the process of learning is really recollection (ἀναμνησις). May we not say that Jesus too held that the truth was buried in every man's soul? a part of His message was already written on the human heart, encrusted over with human traditions, obscured by bad habits, but if only men would turn and become as little children, stripping off all the encrustation, then they would see! And so He was not concerned with giving men masses of information to swallow, but with adjusting their life and vision in such a way that they would find the truth for themselves.

It is surely significant that Jesus never gave men carefully tabulated articles of belief. Instead of creeds He offered parables, and instead of a code of morals, paradoxes. Those who came with their questions expecting a lucid and cogent answer were disappointed when all they got was another question. In the same way, many are offended to-day because Jesus had nothing definite to say about slavery, economics, government, etc. But He had such profound respect for human personality that He refused to give ready-made conclusions; with Him there were no short cuts to the truth.

Some one has suggested, for a coat of arms of the present age, a question mark rampant and three bishops dormant! And it is true that the question marks are rampant enough. We demand pronouncements and encyclicals; we want other people to do our thinking for us. But Jesus wants the free development of the personality and a fresh personal discovery of the truth. He took tremendous risks in following this method, but He was determined that His followers should not be a lot of parasites, sheltering among infallible authorities, but that they should fight their own battles and do their own wrestling with reality.

In this way He combined authority and private judgment; He avoided the dilemma by teaching men in a way that preserved and developed personal initiative and inquiry. With us an age of oppressive authority is followed by one of irresponsible individualism. But in a wonderful way Jesus avoided the perils of two extremes and conserved what was good in each.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that the presence of the same feature in all the Gospels confirms our confidence in them as historical documents. If the separate paragraphs had been manufactured by the Early Church in the manner suggested by some of the more extreme of the Form Critics, it would have been impossible for this definite personal trait in the character of Jesus to have emerged.

# Entre Nous.

**Problem of the Jews.**

In his new book, *The Church and the New Order* (S.C.M.; 6s. net), Dr. William Paton naturally has something to say about the problems of the Jews. He finds that these are six in number. (1) There is the fact that the Nazi domination of Europe is producing a destitute proletariat out of the Jews. How can they be restored to a worthy place in the social order? (2) Anti-semitic legislation is now incorporated into legal codes, and anti-semitism is a big vested interest. Any immediate reversal here will be difficult. (3) Where there are economic problems in countries such as Poland this tends to become a 'Jewish' problem because the Jews being different inevitably become the scapegoat. (4) As there are about sixteen millions of Jews there is little likelihood that emigration can solve the Jewish problem although it can do much. (5) The Jew is made partly by his tradition and partly by his experience, which has been supplied to him by the Gentiles. And so the problem is, as Mr. Louis Golding observes, at least as much a Gentile problem as a Jewish. (6) There is the question of Zionism.

'Christians need to be greatly concerned about these problems of the Jews, for two reasons. One is that the Jew believes, and with some justice, that his sufferings through the centuries have been caused by Christians who hold him guilty of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. I have met educated and cultivated Jews who believe that this is still so, and that the way in which the story of our Lord is taught to the young must have the effect of creating anti-semitism. I can only repeat, with hearty agreement, a remark made to me by Dr. William Adams Brown of New York. "I was never taught when I was a child that it was the Jews who killed Jesus. I was taught that it was my sins and the sins of other people like me that brought Him to the cross."'

'The other reason for the importance of the lot of Jewry to the Christian Church is that that same particularity which is an offence in the Jew arises from something which in its completed form is vital to the Christian revelation. The Jew is always a nuisance to every community which wishes to be wholly homogeneous, and where the rulers suspect and fear all variety and individuality. A community that is bound by a divine law, the Torah, is inevitably suspect to Nazi rulers. But the Christian religion, while it has removed all limitations of race and nation from its promises, holds as its inmost *arcanum* of faith that the very God became incarnate at a point in space and time, and offers as its central philosophical problem the revelation of the infinite in the particular. For this reason Christians should be on guard when anti-semitism raises its ugly head. As Professor Macmurray once remarked to me: "When you find anti-semitism you may be sure that the real fight is about Christianity"—a paradox, but one that contains a vital truth.'

A question which Dr. Paton asks is, Will the religion of the Jews outlast a prolonged period of assimilation should the Gentile world decide to treat him just as a human being and not as a Jew? There is some evidence that Judaism as a religion, is at a low-ebb—there is, for example, no doubt about the emptiness of its synagogues. But this is Judaism as seen by the outsider. As seen through the eyes of a Jew the picture is very different. There is an interesting and curious article in *The International Review of Missions* for July by Hans Kosmala which gives the Jewish orthodox point of view on the question of religious assimilation.

How can Judaism and Christianity come together. Mr. Kosmala states what he believes to be the traditional view. He believes that the Jews have a missionary task towards the Gentiles—not to make Jewish proselytes amongst Christians, but to make them true sons of Noah. What is open to Christians is not Judaism but Noachism. They are not and cannot be the people of the Covenant—the Covenant made with Abraham—but there was an earlier Covenant, the one which God made with Noah, and there were commandments which the sons of Noah were to observe.

'The sons of Noah were given seven commandments: in respect of idolatry, incest (unchastity), shedding of blood, profanation of the name of God, justice, robbery, cutting off of flesh or limb from a living animal (GenR Noah 34, 8).

'Whosoever receives the seven commandments, and is careful to observe them, he is one of the pious of the nations of the world, and has a share in the world to come (Maimonides, HMel 8, 10).

'Thus Moses, our master, has commanded us, by Divine tradition, to compel all that come into the world to take upon themselves the commandments imposed upon the sons of Noah, and whosoever will not receive them is to be put to death' (Maimonides, l.c.).

But Christianity must first be radically modified as it transgresses the commandments in respect of idolatry and profanation of the name of God. 'Jesus was condemned to death because he regarded himself as "the Son of God." This was profanation. Christianity worships Jesus as God, not to mention the Trinity. This is profanation and idolatry.'

What is left of Christianity? There is left, Mr. Kosmala says, 'the manhood of Jesus and his sublime moral teaching.' 'Liberal Christianity,' he says, 'already serves as the forerunner and pioneer of Noachism.' To this *The Modern Churchman* replies. 'Had Mr. Hans Kosmala told his readers that the regeneration of Judaism was to be effected on the lines of Liberal Judaism as expounded by Dr. Claude Montefiore and its other able leaders in Great Britain and America, and that through this movement in conjunction with Liberal Christianity the religious forces of Judaism and Christianity would be finally united, we should not only have welcomed his prognostications but have regarded them as credible. As Liberal Christians we are convinced that it is only along these lines that the middle wall of partition between Judaism and Christianity can be broken down. But when Mr. Hans Kosmala propounds the view

that this union is to be secured by means of Noachism we regard his forecast as due to a vision of the night inspired by reading, before retiring to bed, Mr. H. G. Wells' latest *jeu d'esprit, All Aboard for Ararat.*'

---

**Pat McCormick.**

No life could have been more crowded than that of the Rev. Pat McCormick from the time when he was ordained. He gave up a chaplaincy in the Army because he saw the need of men to minister to the gold-miners. He took a job at Jumpers Deep near Jo'burg. 'The men were a tough, hard-drinking, hard-swearing lot, and the arrival of a preacher was not welcome. They ragged him mercilessly. They deliberately swore in his presence and told every kind of story they thought would shock him, and referred to him always as "the Preacher." But Pat "took it" in his own quiet way, although inwardly he often despaired. He joined the famous Wanderers' Rugby Football Club in Johannesburg, where the men congregated on Saturday afternoons. Pat was a fine, hefty forward, and a magnificent tackler, and the men watched and cheered as many a giant hurtling down the field was brought to earth. Pat used to tell a story of a pastoral visit he paid in his early days at Jumpers Deep. He knocked at the door of a hut and was told to come in. When they saw it was the Preacher he was met with scowls. Suddenly one of the men said, "Are you the parson bloke wot plays for the Wanderers?" Pat said he was. "Come in then, sir," was the hearty welcome, "and have a glass of beer." So he went in and they had a long yarn.'

When war broke out in 1914 he joined up. 'Within a month of joining the Army he saw active service, within a year he was chaplain to a Brigade, within two years he was chaplain to a Division, within three years he was chaplain to a Corps, and before the end of the war he was Acting Chaplain General at Boulogne. He was awarded the D.S.O. and mentioned in despatches on four occasions.'

After the war there came his time at Croydon. 'To make Croydon a better place to live in,' he said, 'does not merely mean that people should have a good time; but that Croydon should be made a place where every citizen may have the fullest possible life. Where men will live together in goodwill, where the strong will help the weak and the rich assist the poor; where every one will try to deal with others as they would like others to deal with them. That is our objective. It is the objective for which many men in the war gave their all.'

But it is with St. Martin's that Pat McCormick's name will be associated most closely. The work that he did there was tremendous, and this in addition to broadcasting and much public speaking elsewhere. In the present war the life in the Crypt of St. Martin's has been an outstanding feature of London. 'Every night, nowadays, underground, in the bowels of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, a new teeming life, possibly the embryo of a new order of society, can be witnessed. About dusk the first shelterers begin to arrive with their baggage, blankets, and bedding, and choose out their favourite corners in the Crypt. By eight o'clock the place is fairly full, and queues of people outside the dormitories awaiting admission.

'About nine, Pat would walk slowly through the crowds. He would stop and chat to the people as he passed from one to another. For one thing he must go and see Baby Martin, so named because he was practically born in the Crypt. His mother was rushed to the Charing Cross Hospital just in time for the happy event; and returned to the Crypt nine days afterwards and has lived there ever since.

'A party of Jews congregate around the altar. Deny the Saviour they may or may not, but they do not hesitate to come to His church, in a very real sense "to be saved." Then there is the picturesque old man with a mass of snow-white hair and flowing beard, looking like a Rip Van Winkle from another world.

'At nine o'clock, standing in front of the altar, Pat would call for silence, give out any notices which he thought necessary, with a joke thrown in to cheer the many heavy-laden hearts, and then, "We will say a prayer." It was always the same prayer: "Grant to us, Lord, the royalty of inward happiness and the serenity which comes from living close to Thee. Daily renew in us a sense of joy and let Thy Spirit dwell in our hearts that we may bear about the infection of a good courage, and may meet all life's ills and accidents, yea, even death itself, with gallant and high-hearted happiness, giving Thee thanks always for all things."'

The short 'Life' of Dick Sheppard by the Rev. R. J. Northcott will be remembered. He has now written on somewhat similar lines that of *Pat McCormick* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), and it is from this that we have taken the above extracts. We have only one criticism to make—it is too short.

### The Interpretation of God's Will in the Present Crisis.

Professor John Baillie speaking at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in May said: 'There is no more hopeful feature of the present situation than the fact that reason, humanity, freedom, and brotherhood are beginning to wonder whether they are not to find, after all, their stoutest ally in the Christian Church, whether those ideals of theirs can continue to exist and be a power in the world unless they find themselves back to the shelter of a full Christian conviction.

'The present muddle cannot be set right by the mere fact of victory in war. It will only give to our Western nations a chance of so mending their ways that the same disaster will not soon again occur.

'The Church must not think of herself as merely defending an order of society which is now being threatened by our foes. The Church must think of herself as pointing the way, by God's help, to a better order—an order which will no longer bear the seeds of its own dissolution.

'If Christian thought and initiative can give a lead in that direction I believe signs are not wanting that men may be ready to follow. I believe there is a subconsciousness in the mind of our nation, especially since the collapse of France, that our enemies, being possessed of a devil, have a kind of strength that we can never oppose with sufficient power on the basis of merely secular national philosophy.

'The Church's great duty and opportunity in our time is to raise that subconscious feeling to full consciousness, fortify it and instruct it to the ends of the Christian gospel.'

---

### James Chalmers.

A hundred years ago James Chalmers, missionary and saint, was born. Robert Louis Stevenson felt for him 'a kind of hero-worship, a greater admiration than for any man of modern times except Charles Gordon.' He describes him as 'a big, stout, wildish looking man, iron-grey, with big bold black eyes and a deep straight furrow down each cheek.' 'Ilico,' writing in *The British Weekly*, says: 'One of my very early recollections is of being taken to a missionary meeting with a tea attached to it. At tea, by luck or courtesy or guile, I sat immediately in front of him across the long table. I ventured to speak to him. He spoke to me. What we said to one another, he and I, is no business of yours; besides, I cannot remember.

'Afterwards I listened to his address. His words, so the psychologists assure me, lie to this day in my unconscious regions. But whatever he said, he was real; he had actually preached to the heathen, and he was splendid. A very short time afterwards news was brought to us that James Chalmers of New Guinea had died a martyr's death. He had been done to death like that in preaching the Gospel to the heathen; he was a martyr like the martyrs of old, and I had seen and spoken with a martyr.

'James Chalmers, missionary and martyr, is not only an heroic figure; he is also a symbol. In the last resort there are only two ways of dealing with "primitive" peoples—the way of missions and the way of violence and exploitation. There are many blots upon our imperial history, but we have tried, and are ever more deliberately and consciously trying, to exercise our suzerainty as a trust. The martyrdom of James Chalmers was followed in due time by the governorship of the famous brother of Dr. Gilbert Murray; the one was the glory of the Church, the other of the Christian State.'

---

### Walk and Pray.

In 1896 James Chalmers was in England. When speaking at a crowded meeting at Plymouth, one of the stories he told has been remembered by the Rev. W. J. Hatch, who was in charge of the meeting: 'It stands out vividly in my memory. His party had visited a new district in Papua, and a real gang of cannibals followed them as they walked back to their boat some distance along the shore. The Papuans saw their visitors would soon be gone, and, if action were not taken quickly, they would miss a high-class feast, so one section of the crowd proposed to catch, hold and kill the company. They were not unanimous, as sharing might be difficult afterwards. The Samoan teachers with him became nervous and suggested that they should kneel down and pray to God for protection. "No," said Chalmers, "let us *walk* along and pray," and, throwing handfuls of beads among the savages, the party made off to the boat in double-quick time. Most of them got safely away.'

---

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.